

UNDERSTANDING HISTORY

Manipulating History

**Ernst Zündel Responds
to the
Atlantic Monthly Article
by D.D. Guttenplan
Re: The Irving/ Lipstadt Trial**

*Note: In this booklet, Ernst Zündel replies to an article in the Atlantic Monthly, February 2000 issue. Paragraph pairs are numbered and separated by a line. Mr. Zündel's answers are **bolded**.*

The Holocaust on Trial - by D. D. Guttenplan

=====

1. Guttenplan: A controversial British writer, David Irving, has instigated a libel suit against an American historian [Deborah Lipstadt] for calling him "one of the most dangerous spokespersons for Holocaust denial." The trial, just beginning in Britain, will almost inevitably be used by some to claim legitimacy for Holocaust "revisionism" — as if the Holocaust as a historical fact were open to debate.

ANSWER TO 1. Mr. Guttenplan lays down the "ground rules" for this article:

a. - Assumption: "There was a Holocaust . . . " - something he does not describe or define -

b. Dogma and Dictate: "... as if the Holocaust as a historical fact were open to debate . . . " - thereby brazenly proclaiming the taboo, and

c. "Here is my Evidence": Guttenplan spends 19 pages, totaling 150 paragraphs, exploring and eroding his own dogma, disturbed and frightened by what he finds — only to return at the end to current Holocaust orthodoxy, invoking "the sanctity of facts" that Hilberg the Atheist is so fond of.

Let us look at Guttenplan's arguments and mindset. Napoleon Hill, an eminently successful American thinker and author of many self-improvement books — one of which, "Think and Grow Rich", sold over 12 million copies" — said half a century ago: "Every time you talk, your mind goes on parade."

Here, then, is D.D. Guttenplan's "mind on parade":

=====

2. Guttenplan: First they came for the Jews ..."

Of all the "lessons" of the Holocaust, Pastor Martin Niemöller's unsparing account of his own complicity in the escalating brutality of life in Nazi Germany

is probably the best known. When Americans talk about the Holocaust — from Vice President Al Gore speaking at a Holocaust remembrance ceremony in Washington, D.C., to the aids activist Mary Fisher at the 1992 Republican Convention — Niemöller's litany of indifference, "but I was not a Jew ...," almost always comes up. It is one of the things everybody knows about the Holocaust, along with the bars of soap made from the fat of murdered Jews, and the gas chambers at Dachau and Belsen.

ANSWER TO 2. Interesting that American politicians of the last 70 years have to go overseas to "Nazi Germany" for their definition of "public indifference", when they have a full stable of domestic "indifference" of their own - from slavery, to segregation, to putting American Indians into concentration areas called "reservations", and on and on and on. Was there a massive outcry against these evils in colonial, revolutionary, or even modern America? The answer is: No, there was not!

Blacks were riding in the back of American busses, having to go to "Blacks only" drinking fountains, "Blacks only" washrooms, "Blacks only" bars, hotels and even whorehouses. There were no civil rights marches in America when Niemöller excoriated the Germans. The majority of Americans were indifferent to the indecencies, pain and humiliation they visited on their own minorities in the 1920s, '30s and 1940s. The only people marching in those days were the Ku Klux Klan members on the way to a cross burning or lynching!

When America went to war against "racist Hitler", Americans did so with a virtually racially segregated army! Talk about "indifference"! Or let us talk about today. Guttenplan, who is Jewish, has never written one article about the present (and past) Israeli brutality, segregation and oppressive treatment of the Palestinians by his fellow Jews in Israel! Here Guttenplan's mind is clearly on parade — indifferent to the Jews' victims!

=====

3. Guttenplan: The problem is, what everybody knows about the Holocaust isn't always true. Although the grisly tale of human beings rendered into soap figured in some of the earliest accounts of events inside Nazi-occupied Europe, it is now universally rejected by historians as a fabrication — similar to the atrocity stories that were a staple of Allied propaganda during the First World War.

ANSWER TO 3. Is that so?! Read this and decide for yourself!

a. The International Military Tribunal held in its judgment in 1946

that "in some instances, attempts were made to utilize the fat from the bodies of the victims in the commercial manufacture of soap. (Judgement, p. 252)

b. Guttenplan's own hero, Dr. Hilberg, hemmed and hawed in a Toronto courtroom in 1985 for page after page of transcripts because he, as a Jew, could not bring himself to admit that fellow Jews had lied for forty years about the Germans "... having made soap from Jews." After an intense grilling by Zündel Defense Attorney, Doug Christie, he still called it "a rumor" — not a lie!

c. In 1990, Israel's Holocaust Museum admitted the Nazis never made soap from human fat of murdered Jews during the Second World War ("Human fat wasn't used by Nazis, Israel's Holocaust Museum says" The Globe and Mail, April 25, 1990)

d. Yet even as this booklet goes to print, Ernst Zündel is on trial in Canada before a Human Rights Tribunal, charged among many other things for a document debunking "Human Soap" that's on the Zundelsite — a website located in America and run by an American citizen. That sick story about "soap made from Jews" is still used by mostly Jewish propagandists against the Germans to this day!

=====

4. Guttenplan: The concentration camp at Dachau did have a gas chamber, but it was never used. There were no gas chambers at Belsen.

ANSWER TO 4. In this sentence Guttenplan slyly adopts all the fruits of Revisionist research and scholarship, for which people like Dr. Faurisson, Udo Walendy and I, Ernst Zündel, have paid a dear price - in being dragged before courts, tried in lengthy trials and convicted to huge fines and years of imprisonment.

"No gas chambers at Dachau"? Look how the legend was fabricated, and how it slowly died:

a. On April 20, 1945 General Dwight D. Eisenhower invited a committee of leading congressional leaders (and leading newspaper editors) to see the Nazi concentration camps. The report of this committee stated that the distinguishing feature of the Dachau Camp was the "gas chamber."

b. Evidence used at Nuremberg to "prove" the gas chamber at Dachau

included the film *Nazi Concentration Camps*. In his closing address to the tribunal, the British prosecutor, Sir Hartley Shawcross, alleged that gassing had occurred, among many other concentration camps, in Dachau. The judgment of the IMT agreed with the prosecution.

c. In 1960, Dr. Martin Broszat, director of the German Institute for Contemporary History, finally admitted there were no gas chambers at Dachau.

d. Professor Hellmut Diwald documented in his book, *History of the Germans*, 1978, that the rooms displayed at Dachau as “gas chambers” were dummy chambers that the US military had forced imprisoned SS men to build after the capitulation of the camp.

e. Yet the judge in the Zündel case in 1991 in Munich read at length from some Holocaust text, stating that there was a gas chamber and that there were gassings at Dachau — and never mind the evidence to the contrary! He could have verified the facts himself, for the former concentration camp is only 20 miles away from Munich.

Guttenplan simply and shamelessly hijacks the fruit of Holocaust Revisionist scholarship! What does that say about his mindset?

=====

5. Guttenplan: Nor, as it happens, did the Nazis come first for the Jews. In fact, as Peter Novick explains in his brilliant and provocative new book, *The Holocaust in American Life*, “First they came for the Communists” — a circumstance acknowledged by Niemöller, who continued, “. . . but I was not a Communist — so I said nothing. Then they came for the Social Democrats, but I was not a Social Democrats — so I did nothing. Then came the trade unionists, but I was not a trade unionist. And then they came for the Jews, but I was not a Jew — so I did little. Then when they came for me, there was no one left who could stand up for me.”

ANSWER TO 5. Situational ethics and selective and out-of-context quotes are the hallmark of most “Holocaust scholars” - especially those who serve the agenda of Israeli and American Jewish groups. One might also ask: Has Guttenplan come to the defense of Revisionists like Dr. Faurisson or Zündel who were picked up, incarcerated, tried, convicted and jailed? No. He has not only been indifferent to their plight, as this article clearly demonstrates, although he is aware of the problem of the misuse and abuse of the Holocaust by American and Israeli organizations, he joins them, in fact, by aligning himself with them - even while mildly criticizing and

acknowledging some safe aspects of the lie.

=====

6. Guttenplan: Novick describes Gore, Fisher, and the Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C., as “prudently omitting Communists” from their versions of Niemöller’s homily. But as Novick makes clear, prudence and political calculation have influenced our knowledge of the Holocaust from the very beginning. Even the word itself — from the Greek holos, for “whole,” and kaustos, for “burnt” — is contested. In some circles the Hebrew word Shoah, meaning “destruction,” is preferred. The Princeton historian Arno Mayer coined the term “Judeocide” to describe the subject of his controversial study *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* (1988).

ANSWER TO 6. The Holocaust Lobby did not “prudently omit” the reference to Communists. They falsified the words of Niemöller. And “political calculation” means they deliberately used the Holocaust propaganda to serve their political - meaning their Jewish - ethnic agenda. The word “Holocaust” was a propaganda term, appropriated in the middle seventies by the Holocaust promoters. It never had any political meaning attached to it before. Check any dictionary or encyclopedia published before 1975.

“Holocaust”, “genocide of the Jews”, “judeocide” are all emotionally laden trigger words, literally verbal clubs with which to bludgeon critics of the Jewish agenda into submission and silence. It’s a fraudulent use of language. Look at the dictionary definition.

The bottom line is this: You cannot prove “genocide” or “judeocide” with millions of living “Holocaust survivors” — all demanding, and most getting, financial restitution!

=====

7. Guttenplan: For a long time after the war the fate of European Jewry was hardly mentioned, partly because, as the cartoonist Art Spiegelman’s father says in *Maus*, his “survivor’s tale” in cartoon format, “No one wants anyway to hear such stories,” and partly because in the camps liberated by American GIs — Dachau and Buchenwald, for example — only about a fifth of the prisoners were Jews. In Edward R. Murrow’s famous 1945 broadcast from Buchenwald the words “Jew” and “Jewish” are never spoken. Deborah Lipstadt, the author of *Beyond Belief* (1986), a study of American press coverage of the Holocaust at the time, says that even when confronted by the evidence, many correspondents were reluctant to admit “to themselves — and to their readers” the reality of genocide. Lipstadt attributes a portion of this reluctance to anti-Semitism.

ANSWER TO 7. Guttenplan evidently knows very little of the history and propaganda situation of World War II and after. The Nuremberg Trials were dreamed up by Jewish lawyer Jacob and Nehemia Robinson.

Aficionados of the "Holocaust" have often called Jacob Robinson a "historian" and "internationalist jurist" and referred to him as a prime source of authoritative information on what happened to the Jews. Jacob Robinson was, in fact, a cunning East European Jewish shyster with a diabolical plan and agenda. He was the inventor/creator of the "revolutionary concept" of the idea of the Nuremberg Trial for Germany's leaders and the German Reparations scheme.

According to Nahum Goldman, former President of the World Jewish Congress,

"... Apart from my encounter with the survivors of the concentration camps after the liberation, I only returned officially to Germany in order to meet Chancellor Adenauer and open negotiations about reparations. These reparations constitute an extraordinary innovation in terms of international law.

Until then, when a country lost a war, it paid damages to the victor, but it was a matter between states, between governments. Now for the first time a nation was to give reparations either to ordinary individuals or to Israel, which did not legally exist at the time of Hitler's crimes. All the same, I must admit that the idea did not come from me.

During the war the WJC (World Jewish Congress) had created an Institute of Jewish Affairs in New York (its headquarters are now in London). The directors were two great Lithuanian Jewish jurists, Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson. Thanks to them, the Institute worked out two completely revolutionary ideas: the Nuremberg tribunal and German reparations. (Goldman, Nahum, The Jewish Paradox, Grosset & Dunlap, 1978, p 122)

For almost five years, from 1945 to 1950, Europe and the world were awash in propaganda, spread by mostly Jewish journalists and "concentration camp survivors" about "Jewish soap", fiendish medical experiments, gas chambers at Dachau etc. - undoubtedly because the Allies wanted to deflect attention from their own genocidal bombing results, the ethnic cleansing and expulsion of millions of Germans from their ancestral homelands, and the slave labor and death camps of German prisoners of war and civilian detainees by the Soviets, Poles, Czechs, Serbs, the Americans, the British, and the French. The newsreels of the day by the conquerors of defeated

Germany don't speak of "Jewish genocide" — not because they were reluctant to mention it, but because there was no evidence of genocide!

To come back to Dachau, which was the favorite Allied "Death Camp" before Auschwitz replaced it, after no gas chambers could be proven in Dachau:

On the day of the Allied takeover, out of 31,432 live prisoners "liberated", only 2539 were Jews. That is 8% of the inmates. Living Jews! Not dead Jews! That hardly proves "genocide of the Jews" — much less "judeocide"! It proves that relatively few of the inmate population at any one time were Jews!

Lipstadt herself — by her own admission steeped in Jewishness, Judaism and Jewish culture — immediately blames the lack of Americans bemoaning the "genocide" of the Jews right after the war as an act of reluctance, even "anti-Semitism"! What kind of a mindset does she parade around by this?

8. Guttenplan: Novick, who teaches history at the University of Chicago, suggests a different reason for postwar American reticence: with the realignment brought about by the Cold War, talk of the Holocaust was positively inimical to U.S. interests.

"In 1945," he writes, "Americans had cheered as Soviet forces pounded Berlin into rubble; in 1948, Americans organized the Airlift to defend 'gallant Berliners' from Soviet threat."

ANSWER TO 8. Mr. Novick, too, being Jewish of course, suffers either from willful ignorance or selective memory. The Allies, especially the Americans, at the prodding and with the active overrepresentation of Jewish investigators, interrogators, torturers and prosecutors in American, Soviet- and British uniforms, were accusing, trying, convicting and executing or simply arbitrarily murdering Germans all over Europe, without even a show trial, as shown in the recent documentary *The Avengers*. After Stalin, their former ally, threatened to take over the rest of Europe and Asia, the American industrial-military complex needed cannon fodder, namely German troops, to save their ill-gotten gains in Europe against their murderous former ally Stalin. It was not love of the Germans, or lack of "pro-semitism" — it was a cold, calculated survival strategy.

9. Guttenplan: The accompanying ideological retooling took place at breathtaking speed, but in 1950s America, few besides Communists shouted,

"Remember the six million!" For most Americans, including American Jews, the Holocaust was "the wrong atrocity" — mention of it was at best an embarrassment, at worst a cause for suspicion.

ANSWER TO 9. Guttenplan is wrong! Shallow! Surfacty or dishonest! Ilya Ehrenburg coined the "six million dead Jews" figure. It appeared first in English in a news release of the Soviet Embassy in London. The British, the Americans and the Soviets knew that atrocity propaganda against the Germans could serve as a deflection maneuver away from their own murderous activities carried on at the very time by the Soviets in Katyn, Silesia, Prussia and Pomerania, as well as by the Poles and the Czechs, to draw public attention away from their barbaric policies.

On February 29, 1944 the British Ministry of Information sent the following note to the higher British clergy and to the BBC, requesting them to help spread atrocity propaganda:

Sir,

I am directed by the Ministry to send you the following circular letter:

It is often the duty of the good citizens and of the pious Christians to turn a blind eye on the peculiarities of those associated with us.

But the time comes when such peculiarities, while still denied in public, must be taken into account when action by us is called for.

We know the methods of rule employed by the Bolshevik dictator in Russia itself from, for example, the writing and speeches of the Prime Minister himself during the last twenty years. We know how the Red Army behaved in Poland in 1920 and in Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Galicia, and Bessarabia only recently.

We must, therefore, take into account how the Red Army will certainly behave when it overruns Central Europe. Unless precautions are taken, the obviously inevitable horrors which will result will throw an undue strain on public opinion in this country.

We cannot reform the Bolsheviks but we can do our best to save them - and ourselves - from the consequences of their acts. The disclosures of the past quarter of the past quarter of a century will render mere denials unconvincing. The only alternative to denial is to distract public attention from the whole subject.

Experience has shown that the best distraction is atrocity propaganda directed against the enemy. Unfortunately the public is no longer so susceptible as in the days of "Corpse Factory," the Mutilated Belgian Babies," and the "Crucified Canadians."

Your cooperation is therefore earnestly sought to distract public

attention from the doings of the Red Army by your wholehearted support of various charges against the Germans and Japanese which have been and will be put into circulation by the Ministry.

Your expression of belief in such may convince others.

I am, sir, Your obedient servant

(signed)

H. Hewet, Assistant Secretary

There was even a postscript, as follows:

The Ministry can enter into no correspondence of any kind with regard to the communication which should only be disclosed to responsible persons. (Rozek, Edward J., Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland, John Wiley and Sons, NY. page 209-210)

See also John Sack's book, "An Eye for an Eye" about the treatment of millions — and murder of between 60,000 to 80,000 Germans in Silesia — by largely Jewish jailers and torturers from 1945 to 1948. See Michael Hoffman's summary of Jewish Communists at <http://www.hoffman-info.com/communist.html>

=====

10. Guttenplan: Today the Holocaust is ubiquitous. Films such as *Schindler's List* and *Sophie's Choice*, television programs, novels, memoirs, and works of history all add to the sum of what we know — or think we know — about what Raul Hilberg, the pre-eminent scholar in the field, called *The Destruction of the European Jews*.

Hilberg's opus by that title was first published in 1961, but only after having been sat on by academic presses at Columbia and the University of Oklahoma, and rejected outright by Princeton, and only after a Czech refugee donated \$15,000 toward the cost of publication. The first reviews were mostly hostile, and it would be years before Hilberg won any prizes.

ANSWER TO 10. When academic honesty still had a tenuous hold on more or less gentile American universities in the 1960s, books containing absurdities like Hilberg's conjectures, suppositions, faulty and tendentious interpretations, and excerpted and "quoted out of context" German documents and statistics were suspect. These books were seen in those more neutral, more balanced times as self-serving Jewish agenda books. Only after a worldwide campaign, deliberately adopted by Israel, American and other Diaspora Jews at the time to use the Holocaust as a tool for raising money and bludgeoning Israeli critics, did Hilberg find a "former

refugee" to donate the funds to get his Holocaust Lobby agenda book published. The question remains: Was it by accident or deliberate plan that Hilberg had a book ready when it was most needed by and useful to the Lobby?

It should be noted here that Hilberg revised it significantly after being grilled by Zündel lawyer Christie in Toronto in the 1985 Great Holocaust Trial, based on Dr. Faurisson's Revisionist scholarship. The cross-examination of Hilberg so devastated his carefully constructed house of cards that he refused to come back as a government-Holocaust Lobby flak in the 1988 Zündel trial. See Hilberg entire chapter in Barbara Kulaszka's book at <<http://www.lebensraum.org/english/dsmrd/dsmrd09hilberg.html>> ((Ref: *Did Six Million Really Die? Report of the Evidence in the Canadian "False News" Trial of Ernst Zündel - 1988. Edited by Barbara Kulaszka. \$50. Available from: Ingrid Rimland, 6965 El Camino Real, # 105-588, La Costa, CA 92009-4195*))

11. Guttenplan: We need merely consider the reception of Benjamin Wilkomirski's *Fragments* (1995) to see how much has changed. Decorated with endorsements by famous academics, *Fragments* won the National Jewish Book Award for autobiography/memoir, beating out works by Elie Wiesel and Alfred Kazin. Even after evidence mounted that "Wilkomirski" was really Bruno Dössekker, a Swiss musician whose account of a childhood in the concentration camps is completely fictional, *Fragments* continued to attract readers. Such is the public appetite for Holocaust literature.

ANSWER TO 11. Embarrassed, Guttenplan skims over this much promoted and widely acclaimed literary fraud titled "Fragments" - showered with praise by the Holocaust industry, promoted globally for its "sensitivity" etc. — which was finally exposed by a Swiss journalist of Israeli background as a complete invention and fabrication. Incidentally, this courageous Jewish journalist faced nothing but virulent condemnation and opposition from an uncritical publishing industry and academia as well as a brainwashed public for exposing this fraud. Finally, and belatedly, the BBC did an expose on "Fragments" — and the German publisher withdrew it from the market. Only then! Only after numerous translations had been sold in millions of copies around the world!

And get this, please: There is no public appetite for Holocaust literature. Neither is there a desire for Holocaust mini-series on television, or films like *Sophie's Choice* or *Schindler's List*. The public are victimized by incessant hype and promotion of a dishonest, ethnocentric version, the

Jewish version in fact, of WWII history — a circumstance well known to many Jewish academics like Professor Norman Finkelstein and even Professor Peter Novick. Finkelstein especially has paid a heavy price for writing his upcoming *The Holocaust as an Industry*, a book selected to come on the market in July of this year (2000).

12. Guttenplan: How did this change come about? Peter Novick mentions various factors: a gradual easing of the Cold War, outbreaks of neo-Nazism in Germany and the United States, the 1952 publication of *Anne Frank: The Diary of A Young Girl*, later adapted to stage and screen. But the single greatest catalyst, he says, was the kidnapping and trial of the Nazi war criminal Adolf Eichmann. Here, too, much of the initial response was negative: The *New Republic* said that Israel should "confess error and hand Eichmann back" to Argentina. The *Wall Street Journal* worried that the proceedings would only benefit the Russians. But as the trial wore on, the sheer mass of detail evidently overcame such skepticism. The trial was televised, and for the first time the American public was confronted with the Holocaust as an event distinct from the general carnage of war. The controversy over Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (1963) — Arendt's focus on Eichmann's ordinariness, on what she called "the banality of evil," struck some commentators as overly sympathetic — further piqued public interest.

ANSWER TO 12. Hyperbole and obfuscation are evident in this paragraph of Guttenplan's article. Franklin D. Roosevelt's statement about "Things just don't happen; they are planned this way" comes to mind.

From the drummed-up charges leveled in Nuremberg against the German leadership — and German people who elected those leaders — to the doctored or concocted *Diary of Anne Frank*, to the conveniently staged show trial of Adolf Eichmann, down to the monstrous Demjanjuk spectacle, there runs a thick line, as thick as a ship's hawser, of the Zionist-Jewish agenda. These events and literary products did not just happen by a fluke of circumstance, by random chance. It is not that the public had its interest piqued by thirty-, forty- or fifty-year-old tales of ever more fanciful horrors!

Those who have the ear of our morally and politically bankrupt political and academic elites in the Western world have force-fed Western society, like stuffing some hapless goose, with their coolly and cruelly, exploitatively used Holocaust agenda. They manipulated our best qualities - like compassion, feelings of honor, fairness towards the Jewish victims - for callously calculated political, ethnic and financial advantage. In other words, they pulled the wool over our eyes - shrieking "Nazi!" and

“Holocaust!” as they were fleeing us!

=====

13. Guttenplan: Now, nearly forty years after Eichmann’s capture, the Holocaust is once again on trial. This time the venue is London, Courtroom 37 of the Royal Courts of Justice, where for the next few months Charles Gray, a judge of the Queen’s Bench, will preside over the matter of David Irving v. Penguin Books Ltd. and Deborah Lipstadt. To Irving, the author of numerous books on the Third Reich, the Holocaust is “an ill-fitting legend.” Irving doesn’t deny that many Jews died. Instead he denies that any of them were killed in gas chambers, that Hitler directly ordered the annihilation of European Jewry, and that the killings were in any significant way different from the other atrocities of the Second World War.

Of course, many right-wing cranks have argued along similar lines. What makes Irving different is that his views on the Holocaust appear in the context of work that has been respected, even admired, by some of the leading historians in Britain and the United States.

ANSWER TO 13. What makes Irving different is not that at all — it is that he has the courage and intellectual integrity to call a spade a spade. And “right wing cranks”? Ad hominem arguments to the rescue! Two thousand years ago, the philosopher Seneca said: “When you have lost an argument — all is not lost. You can still call your enemy names!”

Irving is right; the Holocaust is an “ill-fitting legend” — a lie told 6 million or 6 billion times does not turn into the truth by mere repetition. It still remains a lie! When Guttenplan’s hero, Raul Hilberg, was asked in the First Great Holocaust Trial in 1985 to produce a Führer Order to prove his allegation — stated as “fact,” that Hitler had ordered the extermination of the Jews — he could not! He said, after hemming and hawing in the witness box, that he was “at a loss.” But all along, he had insisted there was such an order! After he was flushed out by the cross-examination in the Zundel Trial and confronted with information to the contrary, he promptly proceeded to change his “scholarship” by adding one obscure footnote to subsequent revisions, eliciting a scathing condemnation by his fellow Holocaust Promoter Christopher Browning, in a treatise he pointedly called “The Revised Hilberg.”

=====

14. Guttenplan: In her book *Denying the Holocaust* (1993), Deborah Lipstadt argues that it is precisely Irving’s considerable reputation that makes him “one of the most dangerous spokespersons for Holocaust denial.” “Familiar with historical evidence,” she writes, “he bends it until it conforms with his ideological

leanings and political agenda.”

ANSWER TO 14. Irving is not a Holocaust Revisionist. He has never written anything on the subject, save for the foreword to the English language edition of his *Focal Point Imprint/Leuchter Report*. The Holocaust Lobbyists are building him up as their straw man, because they know that he is easier to steamroller than Professor Butz, Professor Robert Faurisson or Mark Weber would be.

Furthermore, Guttenplan says, quoting Lipstadt: “Familiar with historical evidence. . . he bends it until it conforms with his ideological leanings and political agenda.” Now that is rich indeed! A typical case of what psychologists would call a clear case of projection — where mentally imbalanced, psychopathic people accuse others of what they are doing themselves. It’s like a thief or pickpocket shouting “Hold the thief!” while running for his life!

According to Jewish author, John Sack, there are 85,000 books which have been written about the Holocaust - with only a handful, less than 50, that bring critical analysis to the subject. All the rest are by Jewish writers or their fellow travelers, like Christopher Browning, who also want to nuzzle up to the lucrative feeding trough of Holocaustomania.

Each and every book, from Hilberg’s falsely titled *The Destruction of the European Jews* right down to Arno Mayer, Daniel Goldhagen, Deborah Lipstadt and even D.D. Guttenplan in this piece before us, are guilty, to some extent or another, of bending the evidence to suit their ideological or political agenda - either to promote the Zionist political or Jewish ethnic and religious agenda, or to give vent to their anti-Nazi, anti-German, or pro-Communist feelings and inclinations. Thousands of examples could be cited for this state of their prejudices of 70 years’ duration.

=====

15. Guttenplan: Irving claims that those words are libelous. He cheerfully admits to having said “There were never any gas chambers at Auschwitz” and “The structures which you can now see as a tourist at Auschwitz were erected by the authorities in Poland after World War Two” and are “a fake.” That doesn’t make him a Holocaust denier, he argues, because his comments “are true.” In effect Irving is seeking to put not just Lipstadt but the Holocaust itself on trial — an effort in which he will receive considerable help from British libel law.

ANSWER TO 15. People who sit in glass houses, like Lipstadt, Hilberg, Goldhagen and others, should stop throwing rocks — rocks of false

accusations. There are bound to be people like the Faurissons, the Webers, the Butzes and the Irvings — and, yes, the Zündels of this world! — who will pick up some of those rocks heaved in their direction and who will with the accuracy and resolve of a David-and-Goliath scenario hurl some of those rocks right back at them. David Irving is doing just that now to Lipstadt!

=====

16. Guttenplan: In the United States the burden of proof in a libel case is on the plaintiff. In an American trial, Irving, as a public figure, would have to prove not just that Lipstadt's criticisms were untrue but also that they were made with "knowledge of falsity or with reckless disregard" of the truth. In Britain the burden of proof is on the defendant. It will not be enough for Lipstadt to point out that even historians who "always learn something from" Irving — among them Gordon Craig, of Stanford, who pays tribute to Irving's "energy as a researcher and to the scope and vigor of his publications" — find his views on the Holocaust, in Craig's words, "obtuse and quickly discredited." Lipstadt will actually have to discredit them. She will also have to show that the evidence is so clear-cut that only a willful misreading or conscious distortion of the facts could account for Irving's positions. This will not be easy.

ANSWER TO 16. Deborah Lipstadt could be dragged before an American court for some of her writings and public statements she makes "with knowledge of falsity or with reckless disregard for the truth." They are recorded in her writings and on video. She has not yet been sued in America because of the enormous costs involved — which does not mean that she will get off scot-free in the future.

Whether Irving's views on the Holocaust — whatever they may be at any moment — are "obtuse and quickly discredited," as Guttenplan quotes British historian Gordon Craig as saying, history will tell. The outcome of the Irving-Lipstadt libel trial will settle very little. Irving's win, or Lipstadt's win, will not affect the thirst and search for truth in a world drowning in Jewish agenda-driven spin-doctoring of their exclusive "victimhood." Long after the dust has settled in that trial and Justice Gray has taken off his powdered wig, the struggle for truth in history will go on.

=====

17. Guttenplan: The problem is not a lack of evidence. The destruction of European Jewry was, in Hilberg's central insight, essentially a bureaucratic process, the result of "a series of administrative measures." In their pursuit of the Endlösung — the Final Solution to the Jewish question — the Nazis left all the detritus of any large organization: memoranda, requisition forms, purchase orders, files, and blueprints.

Approximately one million Jews were murdered at Auschwitz, for example, and all of them had to be taken there by train from somewhere else, in the middle of a war in which the railways were the lifelines of the German army. The gas to kill them — Zyklon B — had to be paid for. And the ovens that disposed of the bodies had to be specially built — by Topf and Sons, a German firm that patented the design. Finally, for each Stück — "piece," as the Nazis referred to a Jew — processed, certain items had to be accounted for: money, jewelry, personal effects, dental gold, hair.

ANSWER TO 17. Raul Hilberg, Guttenplan's hero, is not so sure that he would agree. Judge for yourself:

In his 1961 edition of his book *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Hilberg wrote on p. 177 that there were two Hitler Orders.

At the 1985 trial of Ernst Zündel, Hilberg continued to insist that these orders existed, stating that he would not be correcting what he wrote in 1961 in his new forthcoming edition (Trial Transcript, pp. 851-852)

In fact, Hilberg deleted all references to a Hitler order in the body of his work in the new edition published in 1985, shortly after his testimony in the Zündel Trial.

Holocaust historian Christopher Browning noted this as a major interpretational change in Hilberg's work, noting that there was only one reference to a Hitler order buried in a footnote in the new edition ("The Revised Hilberg". Simon Wiesenthal Annual, Vol. 3, 1986)

Invoices for Zyklon B prove no genocidal extermination campaign. They prove the contrary! There are thousands of such invoices from Air-, Naval- and Army as well as SS authorities for this delousing compound, used in every German military facility all over Germany and Europe. Nobody is going to suggest that the SS leadership or the Wehrmacht gassed its own soldiers - in spite of the invoices!

As to blueprints in the Auschwitz, Moscow and German archives, they speak of delousing facilities, morgues, and crematories to dispose of victims of epidemics and Allied bombing raids. Every city in every civilized country in America, Canada, England, France and, yes, Germany, had such crematories.

Crematories are no proof of a plan for or actual act of “genocide” or ‘judeocide.’ They are a public health measure to prevent the spread of disease and epidemics, just as is the “fumigation” of living quarters, like prisoners’ barracks, and the delousing of clothing, bedding, uniforms and people — as the Germans did in World War II. Germany had no DDT, the environmentally destructive American chemical, so they used environmentally-friendly Zyklon B in their facilities. By diabolical spin-doctoring, evil propagandists turned this German life-saving measure into an alleged policy of “mass murder.”

As to the dead being referred to as “Stück”, meaning “piece” in the cremation process, would it have been less offensive to Guttenplan’s Jewish sensibilities if the Germans had called the dead “cadavers”? His obsession shows in that the Germans — sorry, the Nazis! — referred to Jews as “Stück.” He does not tell us what the Germans called Polish, Czech, Hungarian, French, Dutch and German dead.

=====

18. Guttenplan: Hilberg’s mapping of this bureaucracy fills three volumes, but the essential facts of the Holocaust are contained in a series of tables at the end. “Deaths by Cause,” for example, shows that more than 800,000 Jews died as a result of “ghettoization and general privation,” more than 1.3 million were killed by “open-air shootings,” and up to three million were murdered in camps — as many as 2.7 million of these in death camps: specialized extermination centers such as Sobibor, Treblinka, and Belzec. By comparison, 150,000 died in other camps, including concentration camps such as Dachau and Buchenwald. In “Deaths by Country,” Hilberg’s list ranges from the up to three million Jews of Poland to the fewer than 1,000 from Luxembourg, and in “Deaths by Year” he charts the genocide’s rise and fall. But in all three tables the total is the same: 5.1 million Jews.

ANSWER TO 18. Guttenplan could do the world and himself a favor if he did not take everything a fellow Jewish propagandist like Hilberg says as Gospel Truth and Carved-in-Stone - as some divine revelation. It might be instructive for him to peruse the court transcripts of the cross examination of Dr. Hilberg in the 1985 Zündel Trial on this topic. <<http://www.lebensraum.org/english/dsmrd/dsmrd09hilberg.html>>

The first thing he will find is a Hilberg admission that he is not a statistician. The second thing is his admission of the unreliability of Central and East European census figures. Hilberg’s claim that “. . . as many as 2.7 million of these were [murdered] in death camps” is an assertion at best - a bold-faced lie when one begins to look at the detailed historical and statistical

records since compiled by other researchers, based on documents which have surfaced and become available since Hilberg published his judeo-centric thesis.

To give you a flavor of Hilberg skating on thin ice, here are a few quotes from the Hilberg testimony in 1985, as per the above-named Kulaszka book:

Griffiths read from page 29 of the pamphlet:

*With the help of one hundred pages of cross-checked statistics, Professor Rassinier concludes in *Le Drame des Juifs européens* that the number of Jewish casualties during the Second World War could not have exceeded 1,200,000, and he notes that this has finally been accepted as valid by the World Centre of Contemporary Jewish Documentation at Paris.*

However, he regards such a figure as a maximum limit, and refers to the lower estimate of 896,892 casualties in a study of the same problem by the Jewish statistician Raul Hilberg. Rassinier points out that the State of Israel nevertheless continues to claim compensation for six million dead, each one representing an indemnity of 5,000 marks.

Hilberg testified that “the only correct statement in the paragraph” was that his name was Raul Hilberg. Hilberg said he was “actually not” a statistician. He never gave an estimate of 896,892: “not in my book, not in any of my published work, not in any of my unpublished statements that I ever made, not of any kind.” Hilberg believed the figure came from “a calculation, if we may call it a calculation, made by [Rassinier] in which he took two columns. Before and after columns, Jewish population in 1939, Jewish population in 1945, adjusted for anything such as migrations or war casualties. He did not subtract the last column from the first. He subtracted one column from the other, which gave him a number such as 5.4 million... And then he decided that he would have to proceed in this number in order to render it into something proper, so he deducted from it various figments of his imagination, numbers that he concocted, and came up with a bottom line, his, not my bottom line, of 896,892. Here the figure is attributed to me.” (4-748, 749)

Hilberg indicated that his calculation of the Jewish death toll in the Holocaust was in fact over 5 million. “I have broken it down, particularly in the second edition. I can break it down by cause. I can break it down by locality, and now I could even break it down by time, by year... I would say that of this 5.1 million rounded figure in which the term ‘Jew’ is taken as the one adopted by the Germans, roughly up to 3 million were deaths in camps. The vast majority of them, of course, were gassed, but several

hundred thousands in these camps were shot or dying of privation, starvation, disease and so forth; that a 1.3 million or a 1.4 million were shot in systematic operations... such as those of the Einsatzgruppen, but not limited to Einsatzgruppen operations, shot in primarily the occupied USSR, Galicia, but also Serbia and other localities, and that the remainder, deaths from conditions in the ghettos, which can also be calculated because the Korherr reports has numbers about such deaths, and because individual ghettos, Jewish councils in these ghettos sent reports to German agencies. We have these reports indicating the monthly death tolls in such places as Warsaw, which was the largest ghetto, and Lodz, which was the second largest ghetto. We also have data about Lvov, which was the third largest ghetto. Thus we do have a pretty good idea of the death rate in the ghettos which, at the peak, in 1941, was one percent of the population per month.” (4-749 to 751)

Most of the Hilberg testimony deals with numbers shifting in the quicksand under cross-examination. So what are the numbers? Let’s look at Auschwitz alone. Here is a very abbreviated rundown:

- a. The Allies accused the Germans of killing 4 million people at Auschwitz right after the war.
- b. The Krakow Auschwitz Guards and Officials Trial talked about 300,000 dead in Allied-released newsreels in 1948.
- c. In the spring of 1989 Ernst Zündel led an organized “write-in campaign” to Gorbachev. In September of 1989 the Soviet Union released the death registries at Auschwitz, revealing a death figure of 74,000 (New list of Holocaust victims reignites controversy over figures” Washington Jewish Week, March 8, 1990)
- d. In 1990, the plaques at Auschwitz were removed and the toll of dead reduced to 1.1 million (“Poland reduces Auschwitz death toll estimate to 1 million”, The Washington Times, July 17, 1990)
- e. Now the number has been increased to 1.6 million to meet vociferous Jewish demands for more Jewish Auschwitz victims.

At this point, most numbers are highly suspect. Furthermore, Hilberg has admitted there was no plan, no blueprint and no budget for the alleged extermination (“The Holocaust in Perspective”, *Newsday*, February 23, 1983) Yet he was so full of prejudice against Germans that he still testified

in the preliminaries and trial of 1985 — even though he knew better!

=====

19. Guttenplan: Other historians dispute Hilberg’s arithmetic, arguing for a figure closer to six million. Scholars also remain divided on exactly when and why the Nazis shifted from a policy of encouraging Jewish emigration (which saved half of Germany’s Jews) to a policy of extermination (which murdered perhaps 90 percent of Greece’s Jews). And they argue about the role of the camps in the German economy. David Irving uses these divisions — just as he uses ambiguities about the Auschwitz complex, where factories run by Siemens and Krupp, an IG Farben plant for making synthetic rubber, and several coal mines all co-existed with Birkenau, a highly specialized killing center where nearly a million people were gassed to death. But his argument is something different.

ANSWER TO 19. Guttenplan is engaging in a bit of mental calisthenics and typical Holocaust Syndrome arithmetic — and arrives at “nearly a million people were gassed to death” in Birkenau.

Well, the plaques there state (falsely again!) 1.6 million victims. Who is lying — the Poles or Guttenplan? What sources does he base his “revisionist” figures on? Irving can’t revise his figures, but Guttenplan can? Why? Because he is Jewish?

=====

20. Guttenplan: What David Irving actually believes about the Holocaust remains mysterious. He can appear the soul of reason, eager to concede common ground to his adversaries. “I’m not going to dispute most of what they say about the Holocaust,” he told me recently, “most of which — or ninety percent of which — I agree with wholeheartedly.” But he has also referred to “the absurd legends” of the Holocaust, especially the “myth” of the gas chambers, as a “blood libel on the German people.” Irving claims that Hilberg’s arithmetic is not just mistaken but off by an order of magnitude, and that Jewish victims of the Nazis number in the hundreds of thousands, not millions. He is, as he told a BBC interviewer, “a gas-chamber denier.” Finally, he dismisses evidence refuting his claims as postwar fabrication.

ANSWER TO 20. Although waffling, Irving is basically right. One can agree with 90% of the documents shown. The invoices are invoices for a fumigation and delousing compound. One can agree with that! One hundred percent! What Irving and Revisionists totally disagree on is the fraudulent interpretation that these invoices for a delousing compound are proof of a mass murder, much less of a genocidal policy.

Revisionists and Irving agree that there were tens, even hundreds of thousands of casualties in those concentration camps due to overcrowding, epidemics and malnutrition. 100% agreement on that! What revisionists dispute is the false allegation and accusation that there was a deliberate German policy, a plan, or even a budget to exterminate the Jews, the Gypsies, homosexuals or anybody else.

Irving is right when he calls himself a "Gas Chamber Denier." He is on solid ground there, for quite apart from the much maligned Fred Leuchter, who found that these facilities in Auschwitz could not have served as mass execution gas chambers, others with impeccable credentials, like the Austrian engineer, Lüftl, the Austrian fumigation chamber engineer Fröhlich, the German chemist Germar Rudolf all have corroborated in independent studies and texts that no homicidal gas chambers or a policy for the killing of Jews or anybody else existed in the German Reich of Adolf Hitler.

Irving is right! To call the German people and nation "a nation of genocidal killers" is a blood libel against the Germans. The Jews of the world ought to know how such a blood libel rankles - for have they not been loudly whining and complaining about being called "Christ Killers" by religious zealots? Did they not work for 2000 years to lift that curse from themselves? Why should Germans meekly accept the Sign of Cain — of being Jew Killers — just to serve the nefarious political agenda of an expansionist, colonial power, Israel, and its Zionist Fifth Column in the world?

21. Guttenplan: Irving's arguments have a quicksilver quality, and over time he has occupied a number of contradictory positions. But his aim is consistent: "Cutting the Holocaust down to its true size," he said on Australian television in 1996, "makes it comparable with the other crimes of World War Two."

ANSWER TO 21. Anybody who has ever had the misfortune to have to debate or cross-examine so-called "Holocaust survivors" or Holocaust promoters like Hilberg will attest that Irving is not alone with "quicksilver"-like arguments. Read the testimony of the Jewish witnesses and their Communist fellow travelers in the postwar, de-Nazification or Nuremberg trials, or the disgusting war crimes trials which have been instigated by the ilk of Simon Wiesenthal and the character assassins of the US Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations — down to the Frank Walus case and culminating in the Demjanjuk case. "Quicksilver arguments" is a mild description when dealing with these pathological liars and serial perjurers.

Irving is absolutely right, except that he is more cautious than others who say: "Strip the Holocaust of all spin-doctoring and outright lies and forgeries, the false claims and mistranslations of German documents, and what you will end up with are no greater crimes than were routinely committed by the Allies during that terrible conflagration called the Second World War."

22. Guttenplan: To Deborah Lipstadt, David Irving is "an ardent admirer" of Adolf Hitler who skews documents and misrepresents data "to reach historically untenable conclusions." The sum of his arguments, she says, equals Holocaust denial — a position that in her view has no more credibility than the claim that the earth is flat. To Irving the label "Holocaust denier" is itself libelous, a tool to silence his inconvenient truths. The two sides have agreed that the issues involved are too complex, the questions of evidence and interpretation too subtle, to be argued in front of a jury. Instead it will be up to Judge Charles Gray to decide who is telling the truth. But the whole world will be watching.

ANSWER TO 22. Those of us who have actually heard David Irving lecture on World War II have heard him say very few endearing things about Adolf Hitler. He has usually referred to Hitler as a "war criminal" in the same mold as Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Josef Stalin — a comparison which is an insult to Hitler! This supposed "admirer of Adolf Hitler" has lived comfortably off the Hitler era — that is, his version of what he thought Hitler Germany was like.

It is just one more version, an Englishman's quicksilver argument — which is not necessarily the truth either, as many Germans who lived during the Hitler era told me, over and over again. Significantly, a large portrait of Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom Irving calls a "war criminal," adorns the room in Irving's apartment where Guttenplan conducted the Interview. What does that say about Irving's "heroes"?

23. Guttenplan: The "Scamp"

David John Cawdell Irving was born on March 24, 1938, the youngest of four children. His father was a naval officer, and in some interviews Irving strives to give an impression of Country Life. "My mother," he says, "was an artist." Then he catches himself. "A commercial artist. She did pen-and-ink drawings for *Nursery World*." For an Englishman with Irving's keen sense of social distinctions, the difference is considerable. The Irvings lived in Ongar, "the end of the Central Line," a dreary suburb made drearier by a lack of money.

ANSWER TO 23. It seems that Irving has smarted a whole lifetime about his less-than-aristocratic birth. What does that prove?

=====

24. Guttenplan: When Irving was four years old, his father's ship, the HMS Edinburgh, was torpedoed by the Germans. His father survived, but never returned to his wife and family. "I saw my father about twice in my whole life," Irving says. "During the war years we had a motorcar which was up on blocks. It was a Ford, and I remember as a child climbing through the door. Underneath the car I found a battered old board suitcase, which my mother had obviously thrown there, and it was full of a very musty naval uniform, which was beginning to rot."

ANSWER TO 24. There are millions of Russian, German, French and British as well as American kids who never saw their fathers return from the war, or who had fathers who took up with other women. They did not all become Irvings. So the key to his psyche can hardly be found there.

=====

25. Guttenplan: The war dominated Irving's childhood. "I remember standing on the beach at Southsea," he says, "and watching the invasion fleet sail in June, 1944. My mother said that most of them probably wouldn't be coming home." Sent as a day boy to "a minor public school," Irving was "beaten repeatedly." He says, "The final beating came when I'd hung a twelve-foot hammer-and-sickle flag over the main entrance to the school. They had to call the fire brigade to come and bring it down I was a scamp."

ANSWER TO 25. Corporal punishment was the norm in those days, not only in England but in Canada, America and Germany as well. What does that prove? Childhood pranks? Does that make famous writers — or "Holocaust Deniers"?

=====

26. Guttenplan: A year earlier Irving had won the school prize for art appreciation. The award was a book of his choice — to be presented by the deputy prime minister. "I filled in the form saying the prize I wanted to receive was *Mein Kampf*. I arranged for the local press to be there en masse to take a photograph of the deputy prime minister giving me a copy of *Mein Kampf*. I went up on stage and picked up this prize — and it was a German-Russian technical dictionary! I've never read *Mein Kampf* from that day to this."

ANSWER TO 26. Any reader, including the otherwise rather suspicious-of-motives Guttenplan, must wonder if a man with Irving's obvious curiosity and interest in the Führer and his Reich — not to call it an

obsession — would not be interested in the intellectual underpinnings, the very foundation, of his Reich. The primary document, the virtual beginning of the beginning of the Hitler era is *Mein Kampf*. For Irving to claim that he never read it is to stretch the credulity of the reader. More "quicksilver," I suspect. Fear of getting caught in the quicksand of his mindset is the more likely explanation.

=====

27. Guttenplan: Irving's desire to shock also got him into trouble at Imperial College, where he'd been given a one-year scholarship. The student magazine "ran a headline in 1956 that I'd said that seventeen percent of London university students were extreme left-wing or Communists," he says. "The figure of seventeen percent was straight off the top of my head. I just picked a prime number." Irving lost his scholarship after failing his math examination — a failure for which he blames his professor, "a known Communist."

ANSWER TO 27. That ideologically twisted-out-of-shape Communist professors would fail a student who makes politically incorrect noises is nothing new or unusual. Try to write a Revisionist version of the Holocaust in any American, Canadian or German school or university with a Jewish professor in our supposedly enlightened and tolerant times — and you will quickly find out the limits of "academic freedom and inquiry." Young Irving's non-scientifically based 17% student figure — which Guttenplan introduces, I suppose, to cast doubt on his present-day Holocaust arithmetic or calculations — is just a cheap, but typical, rhetorical device used by the people with D. D. Guttenplan's mindset.

=====

28. Guttenplan: To finance his second year of studies, Irving took a job on a concrete gang. He also became fascinated with Oswald Mosley, the former head of the British Union of Fascists, who was running for Parliament. An attempt to join the Royal Air Force was turned down on medical grounds. If Mosley was an odd inspiration for the son of a Second World War veteran, Irving's response to his rejection by the RAF was odder still. He wrote a letter to Krupp, the former Nazi armaments manufacturer, asking for a job in its steel mill. Seized by the Allies after the war, the firm was unable to oblige. But its rival Thyssen, whose owners had fallen out with Hitler after helping him to power, offered Irving a year's work. His fellow steelworkers added a rough-hewn fluency to Irving's high school German; one of them, a native of Dresden, gave him the subject of his first book.

ANSWER TO 28. It is interesting that Guttenplan does not mention what the medical grounds were on which Irving was turned down by the Royal Air Force. That's a pity! Could it be that this would have meant that

Guttenplan and his friends might not have been able to use Irving as such a convenient straw man. built up as the world's greatest "Holocaust Denier" for the purposes of this trial — to be knocked down with an adverse verdict? That whole paragraph has a Yeshiva School feel to it in its subliminal casting of allusions and aspersions coupled with innuendo.

29. Guttenplan: The man had lived through the Allied fire-bombing of the city in February of 1945; his harrowing account of the raid came as a revelation to Irving, who set to work interviewing survivors and combing through German and Allied archival material. Published in 1963, *The Destruction of Dresden* was an immediate best seller. The book's gruesome photographs of Germans burning their dead, which Irving secured from one of his new contacts, ensured maximum press attention for his claim that the bombing raid had killed 135,000 people — a figure that was more than twice the official estimates.

ANSWER TO 29. The Dresden book is a monument to the young Irving, even though it is quite anti-German in tone.

30. Guttenplan: "I imported Dresden into the vocabulary of horror," Irving says proudly. "People now say 'Dresden' in the same breath as they say 'Auschwitz' and 'Hiroshima.' That's my small contribution to the vernacular."

ANSWER TO 30. Irving can justly claim this a credit, a fruit of his labor and pen.

31. Guttenplan: In later years Irving's estimates of the Dresden death toll would fall as low as 35,000 and rise as high as 250,000. And in later years he would sometimes make direct comparisons between Dresden and Auschwitz. "About a hundred thousand people died in Auschwitz," he told an interviewer in 1991. "So even if we're generous and say one quarter of them, twenty-five thousand, were killed by hanging or shooting — twenty-five thousand is a crime, that's true But we killed that many people burning them alive in one night, not in three years, in a city like Pforzheim. We killed five times that number in Dresden in one night."

ANSWER TO 31. His pirouetting through the minefield of the numbers simply reveals Irving's "quicksilver" style of argumentation, which allows him to agree with the off-the-wall calculations of "...97,000 gas van victims in five weeks..." - if one can believe the press reports!

He is right, however, about comparing Dresden to Auschwitz and Pforzheim. Absolutely right!

32. Guttenplan: At the time, however, *The Destruction of Dresden* was important to Irving for other reasons. The book's financial success allowed him to abandon efforts to complete his degree. He immediately began work on two more books: a history of the German rocket program and a biography of Adolf Hitler. "I'd translated the memoirs of [Field Marshal] Wilhelm Keitel, who was hanged at Nuremberg," Irving says. "Keitel's son introduced me to Otto Günsche — the man who burned Hitler's body. He was Hitler's SS adjutant. And Günsche decided he would talk to me, because I was the Englishman who had written about Dresden. That gave me an edge."

ANSWER TO 32. In other words, it took an Englishman to give at least some voice to the defeated German side, while Germans were being cowed and gagged by a vicious, Allied-imposed censorship campaign in "democratic" Germany proper.

33. Guttenplan: Günsche became Irving's passport into "the inner circle of all Hitler devotees, the servants and the adjutants and the colonels and the secondaries, who would meet around the graveside when one of their number died," he says. "And the word was passed: 'He's okay.' And after a while they started producing their diaries and private papers." The result was *Hitler's War*, published in 1977.

ANSWER TO 33. So what? He got leads and used them. That's the way it is done in the journalism, the film, even the police business. Sources are the life blood of any writer — Irving and Guttenplan included.

34. Guttenplan: Writing in *Time* magazine, Lance Morrow found Irving's portrait of "the Führer as a somewhat harried business executive, too preoccupied to know exactly what was happening in his branch offices at Auschwitz and Treblinka," difficult to credit. The historian Hugh Trevor-Roper's review in the *London Sunday Times* referred to Irving's "consistent bias" but went on to say, "No praise can be too high for Irving's indefatigable scholarly industry.... I have enjoyed reading his long work from beginning to end." The military historian John Keegan called *Hitler's War* Irving's "greatest achievement ... indispensable to anyone seeking to understand the war in the round." Fueled by such notices, the book reached No. 8 on British best-seller lists.

ANSWER TO 34. Western academia should be careful when trotting out such phrases as "consistent bias" in historians — especially Hugh-Trevor Roper, the former British intelligence officer, whose writings are replete with only a thinly veiled anti-German bias, disguised by the cowardly "anti-

Nazi" tactic.

=====

35. Guttenplan: The only appreciable dent in Irving's public credibility came when the writer Gitta Sereny and the reporter Lewis Chester checked Irving's documents and re-interviewed his sources, including Otto Günsche, on assignment for the Sunday Times. Less than the sum of its parts, their article contained some damaging details — among them Günsche's admission that "one must assume that [Hitler] did know" about the extermination of the Jews — but ultimately posed little obstacle to Irving's continued prominence.

ANSWER TO 35. "... one must assume that [Hitler] did know" — that's the level of scientific historical scholarship, when one blackens the reputation of a nation of 80 Million Germans? After 55 years of incessant brain bombardment, Günsche "assumes"? What threshold of proof is that?

=====

36. Guttenplan: One reason for this was the authors' focus on the narrow question of Hitler's personal culpability — doubtless a response to Irving's much-publicized standing offer of \$1,000 to anyone who could provide documentary evidence of Hitler's guilt.

ANSWER TO 36. Not one of the Jewish critics has taken Irving up on his \$1,000 offer — certainly not his severest critic, Deborah Lipstadt. Hilberg changed his footnotes about the so recklessly claimed "Führer Order" for the extermination of the Jews when asked to provide the proof for his audacious claim.

=====

37. Guttenplan: And because Sereny is a fellow writer on Nazi themes, Irving could — and does — simply dismiss her as a jealous competitor. Finally, and perhaps most important, although his account of Hitler's role was hard to swallow (not even Keegan and Trevor-Roper took his behind-Hitler's-back thesis seriously), in 1977 David Irving's views on the Holocaust were fairly unexceptionable. Under "Jews: extermination of," the index to Hitler's War lists seventeen entries. There are references to "the extermination camp at Chelmno" and "the extermination center at Treblinka." And Irving's argument that "the burden of guilt for the bloody and mindless massacre of the Jews rests on a large number of Germans, many of them alive today, and not just on one mad dictator, whose order had to be obeyed without question," while debatable, is not very far from the thesis of Daniel Goldhagen's Hitler's Willing Executioners (1996), another book whose dismissal by knowledgeable specialists has done little to hinder its success with the public.

ANSWER TO 37. The difference between Irving and people like

Goldhagen and Guttenplan is this:

When Irving was confronted with the results of Fred Leuchter's 1988 forensic examination of Auschwitz, Birkenau and Maidanek, and realized that these facilities were not gas chambers as he, too, had been conned into believing by clever Holocaust promoters - Irving publicly admitted his error of judgment under oath in the witness stand in Toronto. Goldhagen, Hilberg, Lipstadt and Guttenplan - all of them Jewish! - continued on as if there was nothing to be re-examined. They stuck to their story of German fiendishness and Jewish innocence, holiness or victimhood.

There is a concept in British-Canadian Anglo-Saxon law. It's called "willful blindness." The Goldhagens, Hilbergs, Lipstadts and Guttenplans — and not the Irvings, Faurissons and Zündels of this world — close their eyes to important new facts or disturbing new findings. As Guttenplan reveals in the very first paragraph of this article — "as if the Holocaust as a historical fact was open to debate" — here you have dogmatism writ large! Here you have Eastern European shtetl mentality revealed! Witches cavort with the devil! The sun revolves around the earth! And, of course, the earth is flat! My mind is made up; don't confuse me with the facts, especially not new, scientific facts!

=====

38. Guttenplan: Any damage to Irving's reputation was more than recouped by his involvement in the 1983 debacle over the "Hitler diaries," when Newsweek, the London Sunday Times, and the German magazine Der Stern, which had rushed to publish the diaries in a fanfare of publicity, were forced to admit they'd been conned — or, in the case of Newsweek, which sidestepped the question of the diaries' authenticity, at least deeply embarrassed. Chief among the victims was Hugh Trevor-Roper, ennobled as Lord Dacre, who had authenticated the volumes for the Times. Irving crashed Der Stern's April, 1983, Hamburg press conference; his comments casting doubt on the diaries' provenance were repeated on the Today show. It was his finest hour, recalled with glee by his defenders — most recently Christopher Hitchens, in Vanity Fair, who cited the incident in support of his view that "David Irving is not just a Fascist historian. He is also a great historian of Fascism."

ANSWER TO 38. The willingness of all those important media outlets to believe such a crude forgery as the "Hitler Diaries" — and again evident in the recent Wilkimorski deception! — should convince the readers not to uncritically trust anything else that appears about the Third Reich in those papers or magazines.

=====

39. Guttenplan: A gratifying example of the amateur besting the academic, this account, which turns up in most profiles of Irving, omits a few details. For one thing, it was Irving who first approached the Times in 1982 with an offer to go to Germany and inspect the diaries for the paper. And although he did denounce the diaries at Der Stern's press conference, so did Trevor-Roper. A week later Irving changed his mind — a dizzying sequence that shed little light on the fake diaries but generated a great deal of publicity for his *The Secret Diaries of Hitler's Doctor*, an anodyne collection of notes by the Führer's physician, Theodor Morell, which just happened to be published that week.

ANSWER TO 39. More "quicksilvery" David Irving behavior!

40. Guttenplan: Whatever his merits as a historian, as a self-publicist Irving has few peers. Journalists across the political spectrum testify to his unfailing helpfulness, his willingness to make archives, clipping files, and documents available without preconditions. On two occasions I have been left alone in Irving's study for more than an hour. If Irving has anything to hide, it is hidden in plain sight.

ANSWER TO 40. That's a good summation of David Irving on one of his good days!

41. Guttenplan: The Defendant

Deborah Lipstadt has a bad back. Her condition, she knows, hasn't been helped by the amount of time she's had to spend sleeping on airplanes between her home in Atlanta, where she is the Dorot Professor of Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies at Emory University, and her lawyer's office in London. But as we sit talking in the coffee shop attached to her London hotel, she also gives the impression of being metaphysically wrenched out of her orbit.

ANSWER TO 41. Those of us who have been persecuted in the courts for decades by the Jewish and Israel lobbies' pimps and minions cannot avoid a bit of glee that Ms. Lipstadt finally gets to taste a bit of the treatment she and her Talmudic coterie and network of character assassins have been inflicting on Zion's detractors for the last 60 years!

42. Guttenplan: "I'd much rather be hanging out in the fall foliage in Georgia, hiking the Appalachian trail," she says. The author of two books, and a veteran of hundreds of interviews and dozens of television appearances, Lipstadt is perfectly at ease with the press, slipping on and off the record with the agility of a politician. A large woman with reddish-brown hair, strong features, and a

gravelly New Yorker's voice (think Bette Midler rather than Bess Myerson), she describes herself as "always fighting." She says, "I'm a great dinner-party guest if you want a lively dinner party. If you want peace and quiet, don't invite me."

ANSWER TO 42. Poor Professor Lipstadt, deprived of seeing the fall foliage and instead having to settle for the proverbial London fog! This "lively dinner party guest" has not uttered one word in the courtroom in her own defense, or given an explanation of her motives. Ms. Lipstadt counseled all who would listen to her not to debate the "Holocaust Deniers." She insisted there was nothing to debate. Yet she has kicked off the greatest avalanche of media discussion about the Holocaust down to the minutest detail — like how many pounds of coke (coal) it takes to cremate a body! Week-in and week-out, the Internet is full of Irving chipping away at their edifice of lies. This is truly Karma at work!

43. Guttenplan: But Irving v. Lipstadt is no dinner party, and Lipstadt is not in London to see the sights. "Hello! I'm the defendant here," she says. "If I hadn't fought this, he would have won by default. He could have said — it would have been said — the High Court in London recognizes his definition of the Holocaust. Now, some people would say, 'Oh, that's ludicrous. Who would believe that anyway?' But it's naive to think you can just say, 'I'm going to ignore this.'"

ANSWER TO 43. "The Holocaust on Trial" is the title of Guttenplan's own piece. It is also the title of a book about the 1988 Zündel Trial by Robert Lenski, (available from Ingrid Rimland at 6965 El Camino Real, # 105-588, La Costa, CA 92009-4195).

Lipstadt says she couldn't ignore Irving's challenge. Good! Even if Irving loses, he has won this round! He has forced her, at least through her lawyers and witnesses, to debate the essentials of their fraudulent Holocaust fantasies.

44. Guttenplan: Deborah Lipstadt was not brought up to be naive — or to walk away from a fight. Her father came to the United States from Germany in the 1920s. "Because of the economic situation — nothing to do with anti-Semitism," she offers before being asked. Her mother was born in Canada. Lipstadt herself was born in Manhattan, in 1947, but the family moved to Queens soon afterward. "I went to Jewish day schools there," she says, "and got an intensive Jewish education, both at home and in school."

ANSWER TO 44. The idea that after an “intensive Jewish education” she might have a one-sided or at least somewhat skewed viewpoint, especially when it comes to “Nazis,” obviously never entered her mind!

=====

45. Guttenplan: The Lipstadts considered themselves “modern Orthodox” — partly to distinguish themselves from the black-hatted, caftan-wearing Hasidim, and partly to signify that although they observed Jewish dietary laws and regulated their lives by the Hebrew rather than the secular calendar, they did not set their faces against modern life. “We were very much of this world,” Lipstadt says. “Theater, opera, books, journals, museums.”

ANSWER TO 45. “Modern orthodox” — and writing about an emotional issue so dear and central to the Jewish experience as the Holocaust? Could she have done it fairly, in a balanced, even-handed way? Come on! Give the world a break!

=====

46. Guttenplan: Lipstadt grew up in a mixed neighborhood, but her interactions with non-Jews were limited. “When you’re an observant family, you go to day schools, you keep kosher — just technically you march to the beat of a different drummer,” she says. Class may also have been a factor. The comfortable, parochial, culturally voracious, slightly smug yet socially conscious world of German Jews is difficult to convey to outsiders, though the fiction of Isaac Bashevis Singer provides a wry introduction.

ANSWER TO 46. She is not only steeped in Jewishness; she is besotted by it, like Isaac Bashevis Singer’s shtetl characters!

=====

47. Guttenplan: After her family moved back to Manhattan, in the mid-1960s, Lipstadt says, Singer lived next door. But she is just as proud of the fact that the civil-rights worker Andy Goodman’s family also lived on her street. When Goodman’s body was found in Mississippi, along with those of his murdered comrades, James Chaney and Michael Schwerner, Lipstadt’s father, who had a small headstone business, was commissioned to make his monument. “In the summer of the freedom rides,” Lipstadt says, “I was too young to go down to the South, but I knew that if I had been older, I would have. I remember going with my mother — this was 1964 or 1965 — up to Harlem on a Sunday to participate in a march. It was my mother’s idea.”

ANSWER TO 47. She did not meet Mengele or Schindler, but like all the survivors, she met the famous Singer and civil rights activists Goodman, Chaney and Schwerner. Role models are important in Jewish life after all, rubbing elbows, dropping names of celebrities is a Jewish need and

character trait, as is being involved in revolutionary activities. Going to Harlem no less! Engaging in “radical chic” is what Stokely Carmichael called this “Jewish activity.”

=====

48. Guttenplan: At City College, Lipstadt says ruefully, she was part of “the last generation where you could get a really good education.” She majored in political science and history, spending her junior year in Israel. “I took a couple of courses on the Holocaust, met more survivors than I’d met before,” she says. “Though I’d met survivors growing up, I didn’t know they were survivors. My parents had lots of German Jewish friends, but I didn’t know them as survivors, I just knew them as the Peisers or the Ullmans.”

ANSWER TO 48. “Jewish survivors?” Relatively few were incarcerated for political activities or for purely ethnic affiliation. Many former concentration camp inmates — many of them criminals, con-men, crooks and saboteurs, rapists, check forgers, thieves, robbers and paedophiles — only received “sainthood” in the 1980s. For decades, they were simply former concentration camp inmates.

=====

49. Guttenplan: Just as the academic year was ending, the Six-Day War broke out. Lipstadt decided to remain in Israel another year: “If I’d been there in June of ’67, to go home in July ’67 made no sense.” When she returned to America, she enrolled in the graduate program in Judaic studies at Brandeis. Her priorities were shifting.

ANSWER TO 49. Israel had changed her — not enough, of course, to toil as a Kibbutzim, a pioneer to help build a new country, but just enough to return to the comfort and cozy existence of academic life and studies in the USA?

=====

50. Guttenplan: “I remember showing up at the synagogue my parents went to on the Upper West Side,” she says, “wearing my SNCC [Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee] button, and somebody yelling at me, ‘They’re leftists, anti-Semites, and terrible people!’ I went berserk!”

ANSWER TO 50. The SNCC was a Communist front. Scratch one of these people, and you will find a Communist connection sooner or later — from Einstein to the Rosenbergs.

=====

51. Guttenplan: Like many other Jews of her generation, Lipstadt felt herself pushed from civil rights to Jewish causes by the bitter 1968 struggle between the mostly black parents of Ocean Hill and Brownsville in Brooklyn and the

largely Jewish teachers' union over community control of the schools. Neither side had a monopoly on racism — and there were Jews on both sides of the picket lines once the union went out on strike rather than cede power to the parents. But what Lipstadt saw was “overt anti-Semitism coming from people whose struggle you had always thought ... cut to the core of America.”

ANSWER TO 51. A very interesting revelation! When the Blacks no longer allowed themselves to be manipulated, dominated and used as tools to break down Gentile society and wanted control of their own children's school so they could dictate the Black agenda, they were no longer of any interest to the likes of Lipstadt. Once again, Lipstadt, the blinkered, closed-mind set, steeped-in-Jewishness activist, interprets Black self-assertion as overt “anti-Semitism.” Quite a mindset Ms. Lipstadt reveals here!

=====

52. Guttenplan: Despite her upbringing, Lipstadt describes herself as “not Orthodox.” The exclusion of even the mention of women from so much of Orthodox ritual disturbs her. “I want them to at least acknowledge that you're only talking about the men. Because if the rabbi stands up and says, ‘We need as many people as possible to come tomorrow morning,’ I'll come.” But her discomfort with organized religion — “I'm equally unhappy in any synagogue I go to,” she says, half joking — does not extend to estrangement from organized Judaism. “So much of my personal life is tied up with being Jewish. Being a Jew and being Jewish, culturally, religiously, intellectually — it's what I know best.”

ANSWER TO 52. Before she was “modern orthodox.” Now she is not orthodox? She confesses to be equally unhappy in any synagogue she goes to — she always “fights.” What does that sound like? A malcontent? Like so many of her kind — constantly at war with her surroundings? Could that be the reason she finds so much evidence of “anti-Semitism”? Maybe it's “anti-Lipstadtism” instead?

=====

53. Guttenplan: **“A Paper Eichmann”**

When David Irving and Deborah Lipstadt come face to face in a London courtroom, it will not be their first meeting. That took place in November of 1994, in Atlanta, when Irving turned up at a talk Lipstadt was giving on the danger of legitimizing Holocaust deniers as “the other side” in some historical debate — a theme of Denying the Holocaust, which had been published the previous year. Irving described the encounter in his diary, which he later posted on his Web site.

ANSWER TO 53. What would the Lipstadt side do without those 40 volumes of Irving diaries?

=====

54. Guttenplan: (Irving speaking): I then politely put up my hand. Invited to speak, I boomed in my very English, very loud voice to her: “Professor Lipstadt, I am right in believing you are not a historian, you are a professor of religion?” She answered that she was a professor of religion but (something special else) in history too. I then waded in with verbal fists flying: “I am the David Irving to whom you have made such disparaging reference in your speech “ Brandishing a wad of \$20 bills, Irving repeated his standing offer. Lipstadt attempted to take other questions, but, in Irving's account, “several times I wagged the bundle of \$20 bills aloft, as she was speaking, and hissed: ‘One thousand dollars ... !’” Irving's diary goes on to recount his success in giving away free copies of his books to the students in attendance, who duly lined up afterward for his autograph: “Sweet victory. Then students came to me with copies of the printed invitation to autograph: I did so — they were blank, which meant that either they had not asked Lipstadt for her autograph, or she would have to sign after me. Total Victory! Revenge!”

ANSWER TO 54. Poor Deborah! That must have been an embarrassing moment for her! It is also Irving at his school-boy prankish best.

=====

55. Guttenplan: Three observations immediately suggest themselves: 1) by November of 1994 Irving was clearly aware that Lipstadt had repeatedly and publicly attacked his work; 2) Denying the Holocaust had come out in Britain in 1994, yet 3) far from seeming aggrieved or on the point of seeking redress in a court of law, Irving showed every sign of enjoying playing the “scamp” in his jousts with Lipstadt, and clearly felt that in this contest the advantage was his.

ANSWER TO 55. Why Irving sued is open to conjecture. However, my guess is that he came into possession of documents under the “Freedom of Information” Act in Canada and elsewhere, which revealed a conspiracy to deprive him of his livelihood by a deliberate campaign to damage his reputation that he simply could not ignore, for by then book deals were falling through, sales were falling off sharply, and Irving was facing tough economic times.

=====

56. Guttenplan: David Irving didn't file suit for libel until September of 1996. The previous spring St. Martin's Press had canceled the publication of his Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich. Given Irving's history, available to anyone with a modem or a library card, a certain amount of controversy was to be expected, perhaps even courted. So when Publishers Weekly pronounced

Irving's book "repellent," and Jewish organizations expressed outrage, and Deborah Lipstadt was quoted as saying that St. Martin's Press would hardly sign up the Louisiana white supremacist David Duke for a book on race relations, St. Martin's stood firm. For about two weeks.

ANSWER TO 56. The sequence of events is quite logical. The pressure and public campaign to isolate and discredit him mounted, and Irving decided to hit back. Anybody who knows Irving could have predicted that this would happen. It was as certain as "Amen" follows prayer in a church!

57. Guttenplan: Sometime between the March 22 Daily News report headlined "NAZI BIG'S BIO AUTHOR SPARKS UPROAR" and Frank Rich's April 3 New York Times column calling Irving "Hitler's Spin Artist," Irving's publishers lost their nerve and announced that they were shocked — shocked! — to discover that the book they were on the brink of shipping to stores had suddenly become unpublishable.

ANSWER TO 57. Nonsense. The book was already published to all intents and purposes. Irving's publishers did not want to distribute it, fearing the usual demonstrations, vandalism against bookstores, negative publicity etc. The terror and intimidation campaign — hidden before, but now quite public — worked! Irving knew it. The book trade knew it. The public knew it. This was not the first time this had been done to authors who did not toe the party line. Just look at what happened to Pat Buchanan with his recently released book, *A Republic, Not An Empire*!

58. Guttenplan: The principal effect of this decision, as Christopher Hitchens properly pointed out in a caustic résumé of the scandal in the June, 1996, Vanity Fair, was to transform a man with "depraved ideas" about the Holocaust into a poster boy for free speech. One ancillary effect was to lend the Goebbels book the cachet of suppressed literature. Another was to give rise to Gordon Craig's lofty declaration, in the course of a four-page review of the biography in The New York Review of Books, that "silencing Mr. Irving would be a high price to pay for freedom from the annoyance that he causes us." Craig continued, "The fact is that he knows more about National Socialism than most professional scholars in his field, and students of the years 1933-1945 owe more than they are always willing to admit" to his research. "Such people as David Irving ... have an indispensable part in the historical enterprise, and we dare not disregard their views."

ANSWER TO 58. Irving became a poster boy for free speech. The Holocaust Lobby became the villains, as they still are. He flushed them

out, and now pillories them for the whole world to see. That he makes odd concessions and shoots from the hip is not surprising to those of us who have watched him and who know him. He is often so unpredictable that I think he frequently astonishes himself. Put it down to his "quicksilver"-like personality.

59. Guttenplan: "We dare not." If Craig is right, then we are all — all of us with a stake in "the historical enterprise" — injured parties, deprived of Irving's unique contribution. But what if he's wrong? What if Irving's work is meretricious, sloppy, anti-Semitic, and dishonest? The question has a familiar ring.

ANSWER TO 59. How about if Irving is right, Mr. Guttenplan? What then?

How about verifying Leuchter's findings, which had such a profound impact on Irving so as to change his outlook drastically? Never mind quibbling about interpretation of a few numbers or German phrases. Go for the fundamental argument! Were the gas chambers shown to tourists for the last 40 years in Auschwitz and Birkenau suitable to kill millions of Jews in the manner described by Holocaust schlocks and so-called "survivors"?

Appoint a commission of international experts. Repeat Leuchter's sample taking. Retest them! Refute him scientifically. That will settle the question once and for all!

Neither Deborah Lipstadt nor Guttenplan nor Hilberg have the courage to do that, for they know by now that Leuchter is right! They dare not repeat the test — and so they kill the messenger! They have silenced Leuchter and even symbolically executed him in the Errol Morris documentary, *Mr. Death*. Irving, so far, has been a tougher nut to crack!

60. Guttenplan: In the late 1970s French intellectuals were convulsed over l'affaire Faurisson, which began when Robert Faurisson, a professor of literature at the University of Lyons, published an article in *Le Monde* proclaiming the "good news" that the gas chambers did not exist. "The alleged Hitlerian gas chambers," Faurisson said, "and the so-called genocide of the Jews form a single historical lie whose principal beneficiaries are the State of Israel and international Zionism and whose principal victims are the German people, but not its leaders, and the Palestinian people in its entirety."

ANSWER TO 60. Dr. Faurisson is the originator of the technical approach — of disproving the Holocaust by forensic, scientific means. He is widely acknowledged for his impeccable work and logical arguments. David Irving has adopted Dr. Faurisson's "no holes, no Holocaust" argument during the trial in London.

=====

61. Guttenplan: Faurisson's public supporters were found mostly on the far left of French politics — which is what gave the affair its frisson. When the linguist and political activist Noam Chomsky lent his name to campaigners defending Faurisson's freedom of expression, the controversy became a trans-Atlantic one. There is, Christopher Hitchens once argued, "no obligation, in defending or asserting the right to speak, to pass any comment on the truth or merit of what may be, or is being, said." Indeed, the suggestion of something rank about a speaker's views, as Hitchens gently reminded Chomsky, merely gives those who would defend his right to speak "all the more reason not to speculate" about those views. Hitchens wrote those words fifteen years ago — about five years after he'd done me the first in a long string of kindnesses, still unbroken. So I take no pleasure in pointing out that his first mistake in l'affaire Irving was to ignore his own sound advice, by describing Irving as "a great historian of Fascism."

ANSWER TO 61. More Talmudic gyrations of a member of the tribe — all heat and noise, signifying little.

=====

62. Guttenplan: His second mistake — and here he had lots of company — was to assume that what Irving really wanted was a debate with his critics. Because if that were Irving's objective, all he would have had to do was bide his time. "Someone," Hitchens asserted confidently, "will no doubt pick up where St. Martin's left off."

ANSWER TO 62. How far removed from the reality of the publishing world people like Hitchens and Guttenplan really are! They are so far out of touch with the dismal state of freedom in this world that one can only shudder. Their naive belief portrays a shallowness which I can only call frightening.

=====

63. Guttenplan: What Irving did instead was to sue Deborah Lipstadt and her publisher, Penguin Books, for libel in England (where Lipstadt's costs will amount to hundreds of thousands of pounds even if she wins). At which point it became rather more difficult to defend the proposition that what was at stake was Irving's freedom of speech.

ANSWER TO 63. That's a cork-screwy argument. Freedom of speech does not give the likes of Lipstadt or the people for whom she pimps the right to recklessly and with malice ruin the reputation and livelihood of a deliberately singled out individual. That's why all civilized countries have libel laws.

=====

64. Guttenplan: It is one thing to argue that the cowardly reversal of St. Martin's did more harm — to the cause of free debate and to public understanding of the Holocaust — than if St. Martin's had simply published and let Irving be damned. It is another to maintain that any commercial publisher is under any obligation to publish Irving or anybody else.

ANSWER TO 64. St. Martin's Press had a contract with Irving — namely to publish and distribute that specific book. They had read the manuscript and had undertaken to publish it. Only after the massive Jewish pressure brought to bear on them did they cave in.

=====

65. Guttenplan: The essential distinction — between the power of the state and the decisions of the market — can be pressed too far. And when Lipstadt argues, as she does in Denying the Holocaust, that "the main shortcoming of legal restraints is that they transform the deniers into martyrs," she seems to be setting aside the state's power to silence offending views on tactical grounds alone, rather than as a matter of principle. Faurisson's chief antagonist, the French classicist Pierre Vidal-Naquet, took a different view: "To live with Faurisson? Any other attitude would imply that we were imposing historical truth as legal truth, which is a dangerous attitude available to other fields of application."

ANSWER TO 65. When it comes to the Holocaust topic, there are official "truths" proclaimed by Israel, France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Spain, Poland and, to a degree, even Canada — where to question the Holocaust is already a criminal offense, punishable by huge fines and/or jail. This is a well-known fact. To skirt around that issue, as Guttenplan does here, is to acknowledge it.

=====

66. Guttenplan: A writer whose history of engagement extends from opposing his government's use of torture in Algeria to support for the rights of Palestinians, Vidal-Naquet was in many ways Chomsky's French counterpart. However, perhaps because both his parents had been deported by the Nazis (his mother died at Auschwitz), Vidal-Naquet felt it was just as important to expose Faurisson's distortions as it was to support his right to distort. His skepticism about the role of the state finds no echo in Lipstadt — unlike his argument

against “debating” the Holocaust.

ANSWER TO 66. Lipstadt in her insular, blinkered Jewish world simply does not comprehend these sophisticated, typically French concepts.

=====

67. Guttenplan: Vidal-Naquet wrote,

Confronting an actual Eichmann, one had to resort to armed struggle and, if need be, to ruse. Confronting a paper Eichmann, one should respond with paper In so doing, we are not placing ourselves on the same ground as our enemy. We do not “debate” him; we demonstrate the mechanisms of his lies and falsifications, which may be methodologically useful for the younger generations.

ANSWER TO 67. Let us paraphrase that old fogey, Vidal-Naquet, in this mouthful: ... confronting a paper Holocaust, one should respond with paper... we demonstrate the mechanisms of his lies and falsifications, which may be methodologically useful for the younger generations.”

This is exactly what Revisionists have been doing — “responding on paper” — since George Orwell first asked in 1945: Were there really gas chambers? Every Revisionist since has gone on to “demonstrate the mechanisms of their lies and falsifications” — from Hilberg’s false claim of a Führer Order to kill the Jews to Daniel Goldhagen’s thinly veiled Old-Testament Jewish hatred of the entire German nation — as a “nation of willing Jew killers.”

=====

68. Guttenplan: We need only set this passage from Assassins of Memory, Vidal-Naquet’s elegant, restrained, yet devastating response to Faurisson, beside a similar passage from Denying the Holocaust to see the extent of Lipstadt’s indebtedness. Not ignoring the deniers does not mean engaging them in discussion or debate. In fact, it means not doing that. We cannot debate them for two reasons, one strategic and the other tactical. As we have repeatedly seen, the deniers long to be considered the “other” side. Engaging them in discussion makes them exactly that. Second, they are contemptuous of the very tools that shape any honest debate: truth and reason. Debating them would be like trying to nail a glob of jelly to the wall.

ANSWER TO 68. This is pretty rich, coming from Lipstadt — the “permanent fighter and life of the dinner party” — to accuse her enemies of being contemptuous of the very tools that shape an honest debate: Truth and reason.

Not Lipstadt, nor the Anti-Defamation League, nor the Jewish Board of Deputies, the American Jewish Committee or the World Jewish Congress, much less Israeli sources, have ever used anything else but contemptuousness for Revisionists — and certainly very little truth and reason. It has been raw terror, pressure, boycotts, character assassination, beatings, bombs, arson, criminal charges and economic ruin against their enemies; not reason or truth. The evidence is on the legal books, formulated in Criminal Code language: Truth is not a defense open to those charged under the Holocaust laws in Germany, Israel, Austria, Switzerland, France and lately Canada — as in my case before the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal.

=====

69. Guttenplan: “Like trying to nail a glob of jelly ...” Though she relies on his arguments, Deborah Lipstadt is no Vidal-Naquet. She lacks his intellectual breadth, his clarity of thought and expression, and, most regrettably, his stature as a Jew who has never confined his political engagement to Jewish causes. Nevertheless, her book is an honest attempt to sound a warning about a phenomenon that Vidal-Naquet would be the first to agree deserves our attention.

ANSWER TO 69. “Like trying to nail a glob of jelly to the wall.” If any one person or group is guilty of such behavior, it is people like Hilberg, Browning, Goldhagen et al, along with the organizations for whom they speak. Holocaust promoters are the ones who deserve our attention. Luckily, Jewish academics like Prof. Norman Finkelstein, Prof. Peter Novick and an increasing chorus of Jewish writers and columnists like Krauthammer and Tom Segev are zeroing in on the criminal misuse of the Holocaust for shaking down whole nations and industries for profit.

=====

70. Guttenplan: Robert Faurisson, after all, was a nonentity, an obscure professor in a provincial university. David Irving is a celebrity — William Casey, the former director of the CIA, once wrote him a fan letter. Irving is also much, much cleverer than Faurisson.

ANSWER TO 70. What a cheap, cheap shot! For Mr. Guttenplan’s information: Dr. Faurisson was a highly acclaimed academic in his field of ancient texts and document analysis long before he ever wrote anything about the non-existence of gas chambers. Hardly a non-entity!

=====

71. Guttenplan: “Not My Patch”

Irving describes himself as a “revisionist,” a writer of “real history,” not a Holocaust denier. Not long ago he read me an account, from one of his lectures,

Einsatzgruppen — the security-police units who followed the German army into Poland. “How can they claim I deny the Holocaust?” Anyway, he said, he’s no expert on the Holocaust: “Not my patch.” Besides, the subject bores him.

ANSWER TO 71. More “quicksilver”-like arguments from the non-expert on the Holocaust.

=====

72. Guttenplan: It was as an expert on German documents and the Second World War that Irving flew to Toronto in 1988 to testify in the trial of Ernst Zündel. A German immigrant to Canada, Zündel supplemented his income as a commercial artist by distributing a selection of neo-Nazi and racist literature, including two works of his own: UFOs: Nazi Secret Weapons and The Hitler We Loved and Why. In 1983 Zündel had been charged with willfully publishing “false news” that was “likely to cause injury or mischief to a public interest.” Faurisson came from France to testify for the defense; Raul Hilberg testified for the prosecution. Though Zündel was convicted and sentenced to fifteen months in prison, the conviction was overturned on appeal, and in the 1988 retrial the defense team added two reinforcements.

ANSWER TO 72. Guttenplan and Lipstadt do exactly what they accuse Irving and other Revisionists of doing. Guttenplan and Lipstadt, either deliberately or maliciously, misquote even court transcripts - for neither of them has managed to quote substantial aspects of the Zündel Trials correctly, unless, of course, they simply repeat or quote the lies of others “without attribution of their sources.” One instance: “The Hitler We Loved and Why” was not written by me, as the court record of the 1985 trial clearly reveals.

=====

73. Guttenplan: One was David Irving. The other was Fred Leuchter, who was billed as an engineer specializing in the design and operation of execution apparatus. Engaged by Faurisson on Zündel’s behalf, Leuchter had flown to Poland with a cameraman, a draftsman, and a translator. The group spent three days at Auschwitz and Birkenau and one at Majdanek, chipping off bits of brick and concrete from a number of buildings. These “forensic samples,” as Leuchter described them, were taken to a lab outside of Boston, where the technician was told that the material was from a workmen’s-compensation case.

ANSWER TO 73. What Guttenplan does not reveal is that his hero, Hilberg, refused to come again to testify in the 1988 Zündel Trial because he had just about perjured himself in the first trial with his fancy footwork about non-existent Führer Orders to kill the Jews. See Hilberg’s 1985 testimony - and Christopher Browning’s “revised Hilberg” exposé. <<http://www.lebensraum.org/english/dsmrd/dsmrd12browning.html>>

Lipstadt got Irving’s involvement in the Zündel trial of 1988 all wrong, claiming that he flew to Toronto in January 1988 and helped negotiate Fred Leuchter’s appearance in Boston with Dr. Faurisson. Inaccuracy after inaccuracy - unless, of course, it is a deliberately false statement to damage Irving’s reputation by being personally, directly and deeply involved in the Zündel Trial and Fred Leuchter discovery. At least Guttenplan got this part correct.

=====

74. Guttenplan: Under questioning by the Crown Counsel it emerged that Leuchter’s engineering training consisted of a few undergraduate science courses. His “report” purporting to demonstrate the nonexistence of gas chambers, on which the defense had spent nearly \$50,000, was ruled inadmissible. Leuchter was allowed to give his opinion that it was “impossible” for the structures he had seen in Poland to have been used as gas chambers, that they “wouldn’t have been efficient” and were “too dangerous,” but the second jury was not convinced either. Zündel was again found guilty, though this conviction was overturned in 1992, when Canada’s “false news” law was ruled unconstitutional.

ANSWER TO 74. Here Guttenplan deliberately plays down Leuchter’s role in the trial. He was, in effect, qualified by Judge Thomas as an expert witness and allowed to give wide-ranging evidence. His report was entered as a lettered exhibit for use by the Appeal Court - but denied to the jury. See <<http://www.lebensraum.org/english/dsmrd/dsmrd33leuchter.html>>

=====

75. Guttenplan: Leuchter did acquire at least one convert. For David Irving, who followed him to the witness stand, Leuchter’s account of his Polish field trip apparently struck with the force of a revelation. “My mind has now changed,” he told the court, “... because I understand that the whole of the Holocaust mythology is, after all, open to doubt.” Back in London, Irving’s Focal Point Publications issued the results of Leuchter’s amateur chemistry experiment as a sixty-six-page booklet — with an introduction by David Irving. Irving also removed all mention of gas chambers — except for a single reference to “lurid rumors” — from the most recent edition of Hitler’s War. “If something didn’t happen,” he said, “then you don’t even dignify it with a footnote.”

ANSWER TO 75. Guttenplan, like so many of his fellow travelers and Holocaust addicts, cannot suppress the usual ad hominem arguments, stating that Dr. Faurisson is a “non-entity” or now Fred Leuchter engaging in “amateur chemistry experiments” etc. Odd behavior for a champion of truth and reason.

Irving, unlike his blinkered Lipstadt, Hilberg and Guttenplan detractors, had kept an open mind - and, once confronted with new ideas and evidence, weighed and analyzed what he read in Leuchter’s Report, found it logical, did background

and analyzed what he read in Leuchter's Report, found it logical, did background and fact checking, and changed his mind. Non-dogmatists do that. Revisionists do that. Believers in a religious dogma - i.e. Holocaust cultists - do not.

Irving is right. Lurid rumors and Jewish fantasies, regardless of how many times they have been uncritically repeated and regurgitated like some religious mantra, do not deserve a footnote in a serious history book. If something did not happen, why speculate why it might have happened, and how?

=====

76. Guttenplan: Leuchter, a pathetic character who seems to be fascinated with the mechanics of killing people, is the star of *Mr. Death*, the new film by the investigative documentarian Errol Morris, the director of *The Thin Blue Line*. Morris's camera casts an unflinching eye on his star's many shortcomings. Morris also shows that some of Leuchter's "samples" may have come from structures rebuilt after the war, and he tracks down the lab technician who analyzed these samples. The technician explains that because he wasn't told what the material was for, he simply ground everything up — diluting many thousands of times any traces of cyanide that might have been on the surface. "I don't think the Leuchter results have any meaning," he told Morris.

ANSWER TO 76. The Errol Morris film, *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter Jr.* started out promisingly enough in the initial Harvard and Sundance versions, but when financing became a problem, and distribution was in doubt, it was turned into a typical Jewish agenda movie, with Jewish "activists" shrieking "Anti-Semite!", van Pelt invoking Auschwitz as the "holiest of holies," and Roth's on-camera recantation. There are grossly false presentations in the film, the most glaring being the close-up on the alleged "peephole" in the gas chamber door in Auschwitz I. A sequence totally staged! The actual door shown today in Auschwitz is of wooden construction and is beige in color, the color of compressed saw dust. The close-up of the peep hole in the film is of a metal door, with rivets clearly showing. The film version allows a clear view through the peephole into the gas chamber. The reality is different. There is a shrapnel catching, stuccoed brick wall, four feet behind the door, blocking the view through the peephole. The "original" or, at least, "current" door has latches on it, which allow the door to be opened from the inside as well as the outside. So the "gassees" could simply have opened the door to let the gas and themselves out. Morris does not show this.

Morris also shows me, Ernst Zündel, as "guilty" — mentioning nowhere

else that the Supreme Court of Canada overturned the verdict on August 27, 1992.

Morris shows Jan van Pelt, a Dutch historian of architecture, as he vents forth about "Vergasungskeller" and misinterprets the word as "gassing cellar" which, of course, turns into "gas chamber." "Vergaser" in German means "carburetor" like you find in every car or truck. This carburetor was located in a cellar. What this carburetor was used for is not explained. Van Pelt gives lots of cultish explanations, laced with theological, certainly not scientific terms, such as calling Auschwitz the "holiest of holies" in his narration.

Morris also produces James Roth, who testified in the 1988 trial in Toronto about the Leuchter samples as follows, here summarized in its entirety as the actual court version:

[Dr. James Roth was the twenty-second witness called by the defence. He testified on Thursday, April 21, 1988.]

Dr. James Roth, the laboratory manager of Alpha Analytical Laboratories, testified as to the results of tests done on the numbered samples removed from Auschwitz and Birkenau by Fred A. Leuchter. Roth had obtained his doctorate from Cornell University in analytical chemistry.

Roth testified that he received samples from Fred Leuchter in his capacity as an Analytical Chemist at Alpha Analytical Laboratories. Roth directly supervised the tests performed on the samples and the preparation of the test report. The purpose of the tests was to determine total iron content and total cyanide content in the samples. The identification numbers assigned to the samples were those designated by Leuchter. (33-9274 to 9276)

Total Iron Content

Iron tests were conducted on three of the samples, namely, samples 9, 29 and 32. Results of the tests for total iron content were essentially the same for all three samples. Sample 9 contained 7,580 mg/km; sample 29 contained 6,280 mg/km and sample 32 contained 6,170 mg/km. (33-9276, 9291, 9292) Iron was normally present in brick and mortar and the quantities found in the brick samples tested were fully within the acceptable ranges for brick type. Red bricks were red because of the iron, although even white bricks had these levels of iron present. (33-9306)

Total Cyanide Content

Cyanide was analyzed in a total of 32 samples of which 31 were brick material and one was a gasket material. The minimum trace level for cyanide was one milligram per kilogram of material. Tests results which did not detect cyanide were designated on the report as "ND," meaning "not

detected.”(33-9276 to 9278)

Roth testified that the test results indicated the following: sample 1 showed no detection; sample 2 showed no detection; sample 3 showed no detection; sample 4 showed no detection; sample 5 showed no detection; sample 5 duplicate test showed no detection; sample 6 showed no detection; sample 7 showed no detection; sample 7 spike recovery test indicated 119 percent; sample 8 showed no detection; sample 8 duplicate showed 1.9 milligrams per kilogram; sample 9 showed 6.7 milligrams per kilogram; sample 10 showed no detection; sample 11 showed no detection; sample 12 showed no detection; sample 13 showed no detection; sample 14 showed no detection; sample 15 showed 2.3 milligrams per kilogram; sample 16 showed 1.4 milligrams per kilogram; sample 16 spike recovery test indicated 96 percent; sample 17 showed no detection; sample 18 showed no detection; sample 18 spike recovery test indicated 100 percent; sample 19 showed no detection; sample 19 spike recovery test indicated 120 percent; sample 20 showed no detection; sample 20 duplicate showed 1.4 milligrams per kilogram; sample 21 showed 4.4 milligrams per kilogram; sample 22 showed 1.7 milligrams per kilogram; sample 23 showed no detection; sample 24 showed no detection; sample 25 showed 3.8 milligrams per kilogram; sample 25 duplicate showed 1.9 milligrams per kilogram; sample 26 showed 1.3 milligrams per kilogram; sample 26 spike recovery test indicated 140 percent; sample 27 showed 1.4 milligrams per kilogram; sample 28 showed 1.3 milligrams per kilogram; sample 29 showed 7.9 milligrams per kilogram; sample 30 showed 1.1 milligrams per kilogram; sample 30 duplicate showed no detection; sample 31 showed no detection; sample 32 showed 1,050 milligrams per kilogram. (33- 9278 to 9287) A bar graph of the sample results which Roth had examined and determined to accurately represent the test results was entered as Exhibit 154. (33-9288)

The tests were performed by taking a representative sample of the material that was received by the laboratory, placing it in a flask that could be sealed, adding a low concentration of acidic solution, specifically sulphuric acid, then warming the sample in that solution while in the process passing gas through it. Air passed through the solution and the acidic environment volatilized the cyanide and formed hydrogen cyanide gas. This gas was then passed through a solution of sodium hydroxide. Any hydrogen cyanide would react with the sodium hydroxide to form sodium cyanide. After a period of time required to assume complete removal of any cyanide in the sample, the solution was analysed colour metrically for the presence of cyanide. (33-9280)

This process was repeated with each of the samples, with duplicates on certain selected samples and with spot samples in which known amounts of

cyanide were added to check recovery. Cyanide spike recovery tests performed on several of the samples all indicated that the analyses and the techniques and methods by which the samples were analyzed were valid. (33- 9281 to 9287)

Prussian Blue (ferro-ferri-cyanide)

Roth was shown Exhibit 144, a colour photograph of the blue staining on the wall of Delousing Facility No. 1 at Birkenau from which sample 32 had been removed. He indicated that the blue colour was what was commonly referred to as “Prussian blue.” (33-9289) The chemical definition of Prussian blue was ferro-ferri-cyanide. (33-9297) Prussian blue was an iron cyanide produced by a reaction between iron and the hydrogen cyanide. It was a very stable compound which stayed around a long time. If hydrogen cyanide came into contact with bricks or mortar containing iron, it was fully conceivable that a reaction of the iron and hydrogen cyanide would take place, leaving behind the Prussian blue. (33-9290) In porous materials such as brick and mortar, the Prussian blue could go fairly deep as long as the surface stayed open, but as the Prussian blue formed, it was possible that it would seal the porous material and stop the penetration. If all surface iron was converted to Prussian blue, the reaction would effectively stop for lack of exposed iron. (33 9291)

Roth testified that the iron/cyanide reaction capabilities of samples 9 and 29 were no different from that of sample 32. If samples 9 and 29 had been exposed continually everyday for two years to 300 parts per million of hydrogen cyanide, Roth testified that he would expect to see the formation of the iron cyanide compounds; the so called “Prussian blue” material, in detectable amounts. The reaction of the two substances was an accumulative reaction; the reaction continued with each exposure. One way for this reaction not to occur would be a lack of water. These reactions, in many cases, required water or vapour in order to occur. However, in rooms of normal temperatures and normal humidity, there would be plenty of moisture present for this type of reaction to take place. (33-9293, 9294)

Prussian blue did not normally disappear unless it was physically removed. To be removed from a porous material like a brick it would have to be removed by sandblasting or grinding down the surface or by the application of a strong acid such as high levels of sulphuric, nitric or hydrochloric acid. It would be more difficult to remove from porous surfaces because of the fact that the formation would have taken on depth. (33-9297, 9298) This ended the examination-in-chief of Roth, and his cross-examination commenced.

Roth testified that he did not take the samples or have any control over the sample taking. He agreed that cyanide radicals could exist in forms other than Prussian blue and that the absence of Prussian blue did not necessarily

mean that cyanide radicals were absent. To Pearson's suggestion that a good control sample would have been one where Prussian blue was not present in order to determine if any cyanide radicals were present there, Roth pointed out that there were many samples where no cyanide was detected. (33-9301, 9302)

Roth testified that in order to have Prussian blue, iron must be present and accessible to the cyanide. (33-9301) He agreed that the presence of Prussian blue almost guaranteed that the ferri-cyanide complex was present. (33-9302) How deep Prussian blue would penetrate was totally dependent on many factors, such as the porosity of material and what moisture existed in the area. (33-9303) Asked if a building was blown up with dynamite and the surface blown off, the Prussian blue might thereby be removed, Roth replied that if just the surface was removed and the rest of the material was left, the answer would be yes. The Crown stated this was not what was suggested; the suggestion was that in an explosion the surface of the brick would come off. Roth replied that normally bricks would break up. "Now, if that's removal of the surface, yes." (33-9304)

Roth refused to answer a question dealing with the amount of hydrogen cyanide required to kill insects as opposed to human beings as he felt this was not his area of expertise. (33-9304) He agreed that he would not want to be around 300 parts per million of hydrogen cyanide. (33-9305)

In the movie version of the Errol Morris documentary, *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter*, he says this:

I went up to Toronto, on very short notice, not knowing any of the background, at all, of what was going on. They wanted somebody from the laboratory to say, yes, we analyzed these samples, yes, we produced this report on the analysis, and that's what I was there to do.

I don't think the Leuchter results have any meaning. There's nothing in any of our data that says those surfaces were exposed or not.

Even after I got off the stand, I didn't know where the samples came from. I didn't know which samples were which. And it was only at lunch that I found out, really, what the case involved.

Hindsight being 20/20, the test was not the correct one to have been used for the analysis.

He presented us with rock samples anywhere from the size of your thumb up to half the size of your fist. We broke them up with a hammer so that we could get a sub-sample; we placed it in a flask, add concentrated sulfuric acid. It undergoes a reaction that produces a red-colored solution. It is the intensity of this red color that we can relate with cyanide concentration.

You have to look at what happens to cyanide when it reacts with a wall. Where does it go? How far does it go? Cyanide is a surface reaction. It's probably not going to penetrate more than 10 microns. Human hair is 100 microns in diameter. Crush this sample up, I have just diluted that sample 10,000; 100,000 times. If you're going to go look for it, you're going to look on the surface only. There's no reason to go deep, because it's not going to be there. Which was the exposed surface? I didn't even have any idea. That's like analyzing paint on a wall by analyzing the timber that's behind it. If they go in with blinders on, they will see what they want to see. What was he really trying to do? What was he trying to prove?

The Zündel team is now investigating if perjury charges can be brought against Roth. This investigation is still going on.

=====

77. Guttenplan: Irving appears in the film, and audiences may well find themselves wondering how a man who proclaims himself an expert at detecting forged documents — and who dismisses the countless eyewitness accounts of the Holocaust by those who survived as “really a matter for psychiatric evaluation” — could have been so easily gulled.

ANSWER TO 77. Irving was not easily gulled. Leuchter's “chemical experiments,” so glibly dismissed by Guttenplan, have been replicated by several other experts with impeccable academic credentials. There is the German chemist, Germar Rudolf who issued his own “Rudolf Report,” confirming most of Leuchter's basic findings. Then there is the “Lüftl Report” by Austrian court expert and longtime president of the Austrian Chamber of Engineers who corroborated Leuchter's premises and findings. There is also the Austrian engineer and fumigation chamber expert, Fröhlich, of Vienna, who corroborated Leuchter's views as to the inadequacies of the Auschwitz installations as “gas chambers.”

=====

78. Guttenplan: How significant was Irving's conversion? Holocaust denial has been at the center of trials in Austria, Germany, France, and Canada. Some were criminal proceedings, and some, like the Zündel trial, began when survivors filed civil complaints. But in every one of those trials it has been the deniers who have had to defend themselves. When David Irving walks into Courtroom 37, it will be as the plaintiff, with the scales of British justice tipped in his favor. The defendant in this case is Deborah Lipstadt.

ANSWER TO 78. That's right! Now for once they are on trial! Their concepts are being tested. It is a pity Irving did not get a lawyer to represent him and turn this into a real, in-depth Holocaust trial. He could have been

the one who drove the wooden stake into Dracula's heart and ended the legend.

=====

79. Guttenplan: **Irving's Preoccupations**

My sense of Irving the man was unavoidably colored by sorrow. We had spoken on the phone several times, and had been exchanging e-mails for several months, before the gray afternoon last autumn when I presented myself at his flat, in a red-brick Victorian building off Grosvenor Square, just around the corner from the American embassy. I'd read enough of his interviews to know that Irving could be provocative, truculent, or charming. But when I came to see him, he was none of those things. He seemed deeply tired (he was due to leave for a lecture tour of the United States the following day) and more than a little sad.

ANSWER TO 79. This is undoubtedly a good description of Irving's state of mind and being at the time.

=====

80. Guttenplan: A few days earlier the oldest of his five daughters had committed suicide. Named Josephine Victoria (she was born, in 1963, on the anniversary of Franco's victory in Spain), she'd been schizophrenic, Irving said, for "half her life." More recently she had lost the use of both legs in a car accident. "At the hospital they said to me, 'You know, she must have been very determined.' For someone who is legless to pull herself up and throw herself out of a fourth-floor window ..." Irving stopped and then continued, responding to a question I hadn't asked. "Do you ever wonder whether you are mentally unsound or not? How do we know? There is no thermometer you can stick in your mouth that will say, 'Oh, today I'm a bit unbalanced.'"

ANSWER TO 80. This is an astonishing paragraph. It would be interesting what else was said, especially when one correlates these statements with other factors known and observed by Irving watchers.

=====

81. Guttenplan: I'd been to his flat once in the summer, to pick up some material, but Irving had been away. "Contact my staff (Bente) in London," he e-mailed me. Bente turned out to be the mother of Irving's youngest daughter, Jessica, who had to be collected from school, and so I was left alone, seated in Irving's study leafing through his press clippings under the gaze of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose portrait on the mantelpiece above Irving's desk was flanked by a pair of framed front pages from the *Völkischer Beobachter*, the Nazi Party daily.

ANSWER TO 81. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the "Völkischer

Beobachter" - fancy that! Not only quicksilver arguments — quicksilver tastes as well!

=====

82. Guttenplan: One article, Irving later told me with a certain amount of malicious pleasure, was headlined "PROPHETIC WARNING TO JEWRY" — the paper's report of Hitler's famous January, 1939, speech to the Reichstag:

Today I want to be a prophet once more: If international-finance Jewry inside and outside of Europe should succeed once more in plunging nations into another world war, the consequence will not be the Bolshevization of the earth and thereby the victory of Jewry, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe.

ANSWER TO 82. Annihilation - Ausrottung - here is what came out during the Zündel trial about this speech and this term:

The term ausrotten, said Christie, has been represented to mean 'extermination' in the literal sense. Have you examined that word in its context in the various speeches of Adolf Hitler?

"I am very fluent in the German language, having lived in that country for a long time and having read, of course, millions of words in the German language in context," said Irving. "There is no doubt that in modern Germany the word ausrotten now means murder. But we have to look at the meaning of the word ausrotten in the 1930s and the 1940s, as used by those who wrote or spoke these documents. In the mouth of Adolf Hitler, the word ausrotten is never once used to mean murder, and I've made a study of that particular semantic problem. You can find document after document which Hitler himself spoke or wrote where the word ausrotten cannot possibly mean murder. I can give one or two examples briefly. In August 1936, Hitler dictated the famous memorandum on the four year plan which contains the phrase 'if the Bolsheviks succeed in entering Germany, it will lead to the ausrotten of the German people'. Now, clearly, he doesn't mean that if the Bolsheviks invade

Germany it will lead to the murder of 50 million Germans. He is saying it will lead to the end of Germany as a national state, as a power, as a factor, an end of the German people. He says the same to the Czechoslovakian President Emil Hácha, on March the 15th, 1939. Hácha has just signed away Czechoslovakia's independence in a midnight session with Hitler and Hitler says to him afterwards, 'It is a good thing that you signed because otherwise it would have meant the ausrotten of the Czechoslovakian people'. Hitler didn't mean, 'If you hadn't signed, I would have had to kill 8 million Czechs.' What he is saying [is], 'If you hadn't signed, I would have ended

Czechoslovakia's existence as a separate country.' There are various other examples of that and I defy anybody to find the meaning of the word differently used by Adolf Hitler to mean the word 'murder'. This is the kind of analysis which unfortunately the academic historians have not bothered to conduct." (33-9377, 9378) (Ref: *Did Six Million Really Die? Report of the Evidence in the Canadian "False News" Trial of Ernst Zündel - 1988.* Edited by Barbara Kulaszka.)

=====

83. Guttenplan: This time — perhaps in deference to his siblings, who, though embarrassed by Irving, had come to London for the funeral — the papers had been taken down. Nor was a famous self-portrait of Hitler, given to Irving by the Führer's secretary, anywhere in evidence. And Irving himself, a husky, square-jawed man with a weakness for martial metaphors ("It may be unfortunate for Professor Lipstadt," he had remarked to me on the telephone, "that she is the one who finds herself dragged out of the line and shot"), was on his best behavior.

ANSWER TO 83. An interesting "quicksilver" insight into Irving. Removing pictures on his wall so as not to hurt the feelings of his siblings, one of whom even changed his name so as not to be identified with his brother? Interesting!

The famous "self-portrait" of Hitler referred to was recently shown on CNN by Irving. It is a 4x5-inch piece of paper with a few pencil lines on it, drawn by Hitler as a doodle.

=====

84. Guttenplan: There were glimpses of the Irving I'd read about. "In crude terms, you've got a problem," he said regarding the fate of Hungarian Jews shipped to Auschwitz in 1944, "because you're talking about 45,000 tons of meat." He described "a very good friend": "Sometimes I say, 'He's Jewish but ...' Jewish but very nice, very decent, and so on — from which you can see I have all the stereotypes embedded in me." But these half-hearted attempts to shock me were not very convincing — nor, I think, were they meant to be.

ANSWER TO 84. Once again the sensibilities of Guttenplan are offended. When people are dead, as it is alleged by the Holocaust promoters these Hungarian Jews allegedly were, then the German Auschwitz camp administration had indeed a disposal problem for all these cadavers. The comment, "45,000 tons of meat", is a little tasteless for a cultured Englishman, true — but then Mr. Quicksilver is like that. Guttenplan said himself that Irving likes to shock people.

=====

85. Guttenplan: When he's among friends, Irving's manners are less fastidious. At a lecture in Germany a few years ago a television cameraman captured his wit: "There's the one-man gas chamber, carried by two German soldiers looking for Jews alone in the Polish countryside. This one-man gas chamber must have looked like a sedan chair, but disguised as a telephone kiosk. How did they convince the victim to step, of his own free will, into this one-man gas chamber? Apparently there was a phone in it, which would ring, and the soldier would say, 'It's for you!'"

ANSWER TO 85. Ahhh, that "one man gas chamber" joke! That really got to the Guttenplans and Lipstadts. Jewish writers who make the most insane, outrageous claims about Nazi behavior from "Springtime for Hitler" to "Maus", from Mel Brooks to Charlie Chaplin's depiction of Hitler, get all bent out of shape when somebody pokes fun at their racket. They have no sense of humor when it comes to themselves - they can dish it out, but they cannot take it when the tables are turned.

=====

86. Guttenplan: And there is his light verse, to be recited, according to Irving's diary (which he has had to make available to Lipstadt's lawyers), when out with his daughter and "half-breed children" are wheeled past: "I am a Baby Aryan / Not Jewish or Sectarian / I have no plans to marry an / Ape or Rastafarian." But since Jessica, now six (she spent a portion of our interview sitting on my lap), was barely a year old when that entry was written, the intended audience was probably her mother, whose reaction, Irving noted with satisfaction, was "suitably shocked."

ANSWER TO 86. A private in-house attempt to get a rise out of his partner becomes national — no, international! — headlines! Boy, these people are really groping!

=====

87. Guttenplan: Irving is a prodigious diarist, and though the entries I've seen read more like the first drafts of a press release than like a record of his inner life, the need to fill up the pages does sometimes allow something personal to slip through. His love affairs, for example, are apparently recorded in a code based on the word "amiable," as in "Caroline came round and was amiable." But even the sections cited by the defense in various expert reports hardly reveal a passionate Jew-hater. Irving believes in a worldwide Jewish conspiracy — both to discredit him personally and to exploit the Holocaust for political and economic ends. He habitually refers to Jewish groups as "traditional enemies of the truth," and as far back as 1963, describing a speech by Oswald Mosley at Kensington Town Hall, he wrote, "Yellow Star did not make a showing." But his recurring preoccupations are money and his career, not the Jews.

ANSWER TO 87. So Irving is a womanizer. That hardly disqualifies him as a historian. JFK was a womanizer, which did not disqualify him as a president — not to mention Bill Clinton.

=====

88. Guttenplan: Irving likes to point out that at one time both his lawyer and his publisher were Jews. The lawyer, Michael Rubinstein (who says he's not Jewish), told me that relations with Irving had been proper and professional.

ANSWER TO 88. Michael Rubinstein is not Jewish? I suppose the Pope isn't Catholic.

=====

89. Guttenplan: As for Lord Weidenfeld, the assumption of mutual utility can be gleaned from a letter he sent Irving after a newspaper article, obviously inspired by Irving, suggested that Weidenfeld had been pressured not to publish Hitler's War. "I have every reason to believe," Weidenfeld wrote, "that it was the reporter's tone and not your intention to disturb a businesslike and friendly climate of cooperation between us." The firm of Weidenfeld and Nicholson went on to publish Irving's biographies of Field Marshals Erhard Milch and Erwin Rommel.

ANSWER TO 89. Mr. Weidenfeld is one smart man. Business is business.

=====

90. Guttenplan: In the end, Irving's relationships with individual Jews don't take us very far. Deborah Lipstadt is a Jew, and Irving sued her. But Gitta Sereny is not a Jew, and after she wrote an article for the London Observer accusing him of peddling a "clever mixture of truth and untruth," Irving sued her as well. In fact Lipstadt never accuses Irving of anti-Semitism. She charges him with "Holocaust denial" — an accusation that has also been leveled against some Jews.

ANSWER TO 90. One more proof that Irving is right. Anti-Semitism is a mild pejorative these days. It is running out of steam because of overuse. "Holocaust Denier" is the Auschwitz club with some potency left in it. It is the preferred weapon of choice these days against all infidels, non-believers and critics of all things or all behavior Jewish. "Holocaust Denier" is a deadly label — for the time being at least. Syria, Iran and now Lebanon have become "Holocaust Denial states." When will Austria, Switzerland and maybe even Germany join? Holocaust Denial states! Amazing!

=====

91. Guttenplan: "Judeobolshevism"

In 1962 Commentary asked Hugh Trevor-Roper to review Raul Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews*. Hilberg's analysis of the Nazi machinery of extermination, Trevor-Roper wrote, carried "a profound social content." The "most surprising revelation," he warned Commentary readers, would also be "the least welcome" — namely, Hilberg's depiction of the extent to which the Nazis relied on the Jews to assist in their own destruction.

ANSWER TO 91. "The Nazis relied on the Jews to assist them in their own destruction"? Here Guttenplan is venturing out onto dangerous ground. Nazi-Zionist collaboration has been the big taboo within the even larger taboo. That man must be crazy or suicidal to tackle this topic — even if he cloaks himself in Hugh Trevor-Roper!

=====

92. Guttenplan: The magazine, published then as now by the American Jewish Committee, hastened to counter Trevor-Roper's praise with an article by the Harvard historian Oscar Handlin, titled "Jewish Resistance to the Nazis." Handlin accused Hilberg of "impiety" and "defaming the dead." In 1968, when Hilberg went to Israel on sabbatical, officials at Yad Vashem, the Israeli Holocaust memorial, refused to allow him into the archives (a situation anticipated by the response to his book published in *Yad Vashem Studies*. The review was titled "Historical Research or Slander?").

ANSWER TO 92. Poor Hilberg! So even the Jews in control did not like this book! Sometimes you just can't please anybody. "Impiety" and "defaming the dead"! In Germany, you can get five years for defaming dead Holocaust victims as not having been holocausted! You can defame 89 million living Germans with lies, falsifications, wrong accusations, with a blood libel of genocide against the Jews — but you can end up in jail for saying that these victims died only as a result of war, epidemics, starvation — not as a matter of a deliberate policy.

=====

93. Guttenplan: Eichmann in Jerusalem, Hannah Arendt's report on the Eichmann trial, fared no better. Writing in *The New York Times Book Review*, Barbara Tuchman accused Arendt of "a conscious desire to support Eichmann's defense." The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith condemned what it called an "evil book," reminding its members, It is common knowledge that Eichmann himself deliberately planned the cold-blooded senseless liquidation of an entire people Eichmann personally conceived the idea of liquidating Jews as a means of "solving" the Jewish problem He probably could have successfully proposed mass Jewish emigration to his superiors [but] instead he selected the gas chamber, the crematorium and the soap factory.

ANSWER TO 93. Even Jews like Hannah Ahrendt were targeted! Like a religious incantation, a permanent refrain: "...he selected the gas chamber, the crematorium and the soap factory!" The soap factory! The largest Jewish "Service organization" whose only reason for being allegedly is to stop the "defamation of the Jews" uses one of the most devastating accusations in its ongoing, deliberate defamation of the German nation!

=====

94. Guttenplan: These attacks, as Peter Novick points out, were "not just false but the reverse of the truth." Like Hilberg, Arendt was assailed for highlighting the role of the Jewish communal leadership in the tragedy — perhaps even more virulently than Hilberg, because in her view Jewish leaders had been particularly culpable. "Wherever Jews lived," she wrote, there were recognized Jewish leaders, and this leadership, almost without exception, cooperated in one way or another, for one reason or another, with the Nazis. The whole truth was that if the Jewish people had really been unorganized and leaderless, there would have been chaos and plenty of misery but the total number of victims would hardly have been between four and a half and six million people. Once again Commentary, the voice of the American Jewish leadership, pronounced its anathema, with the editor, Norman Podhoretz, personally declaring Arendt's reports "complex, unsentimental, riddled with paradox and ambiguity" — all, to Podhoretz, apparently, terms of abuse. Arno Mayer's *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* is subtitled "The 'Final Solution' in History." Mayer wanted to rescue the Holocaust from a "cult of remembrance" that in his view had "become overly sectarian" and thus impeded historical understanding. "Whereas the voice of memory is univocal and uncontested, that of history is polyphonic and open to debate," Mayer wrote. History "calls for revision."

ANSWER TO 94. Even Peter Novick says these accusations were "not just false, but the reverse of the truth." I hasten to point out, lest the gullible reader might think he is referring to the "gas chamber", crematory, soap factory accusation — he is not! These lies are okay, in Novick's frame of reference! It's the false accusation that Hannah Ahrendt wanted to help Eichmann, which bothers this Jewish academic.

The Jew Sherman Skolnick of Chicago, whom I met in 1973 during a lecture tour, says that untold millions of dollars in money and valuables entrusted to some of the chief rabbis in Eastern Europe during the German occupation was kept by them, after the names of those trusting Jews ended up on deportation lists supplied to the Germans by Jewish community leaders. Skolnick is actively looking for witnesses, so the surviving Jewish embezzlers, their children or grandchildren, can be sued by the surviving Jewish victims and their heirs. Skolnick claims the money is mainly invested

in real estate and construction companies.

This seems to be one of the deep, dark secrets — little explored, of course by mainstream "Holocaust scholars" or Jewish organizations, who would rather deflect from their own misdeeds by accusing countries like Switzerland, Austria and Germany and shaking down their industries for billions. No wonder Arno Mayer is disliked. Quite correctly he says: "Whereas the voice of memory is univocal and uncontested, that of history is polyphonic and open to debate." He must have really hit a raw nerve when he wrote that "... history calls for revision."

=====

95. Guttenplan: To the Anti-Defamation League those were fighting words. Even worse, Mayer claimed that the Nazis were motivated not by simple anti-Semitism but by a hostility to "Judeobolshevism" — the Nazi word for the belief that Jews controlled both communism and capitalism. Mayer wrote that there was no evidence to suggest that when Adolf Hitler invaded Poland, his objective was "to capture the maximum number of Jews for slaughter." Indeed, the Nazis went to great lengths to push Jews to emigrate. Contrary to Lucy Dawidowicz's *The War Against the Jews* (1975), which argued that genocide was one of the Nazis' principal war aims, Mayer held that Hitler was far more concerned with his "crusade" against communism, and that only after the failure of Operation Barbarossa, the invasion of the Soviet Union, did the Nazis vent their murderous frustration on the Jews of Eastern Europe. Mayer's book jacket carried an endorsement by Pierre Vidal-Naquet, who also wrote a preface to the French edition! !

ANSWER TO 95. Not since Hitler's death did anyone have the intellectual honesty and scholarly integrity to talk systematically and forcefully about the problems caused to the world by "Judeobolshevism." Even well-read Jews like John Sack did not want to admit that Bolshevism was a Jewish brainchild and was used as an instrument of mass murder against any one, class or nation, these psychopathic killers did not like.

Hitler's Army and the much-maligned Einsatzgruppen put a temporary end to that spree of mass murder, until the Western Allies made the victory of the murderous hordes of Stalin's serial killers possible — through their massive bombing campaign against Germany.

The suggestion that "the Nazis vented their murderous frustration on the Jews of Eastern Europe" is clap-trap! Even by their own version of World War II history, the alleged killings started in 1941 — whereas the German reverses on the Eastern front started only in 1943 in Stalingrad.

=====

96. Guttenplan: Mayer's thesis that anti-communism was more important in Nazi ideology than anti-Semitism was certainly open to argument, as was his account of events leading to the Final Solution. But argument was just what Mayer didn't get from his critics, who preferred insult and innuendo. "A mockery of memory and history," 'outrageous,' ... 'bizarre,' and 'perverse'" were, said the historian Richard Evans, reporting on the controversy for a London newspaper, "just some of the more printable" responses. Leading the charge was The New Republic's reviewer, a young Harvard graduate student named Daniel Goldhagen.

ANSWER TO 96. Ahhh, those hired intellectual assassins of the Holocaust establishment! Richard Evans, now used by Lipstadt-Penguin, made a name for himself even then by attacking a Jew like Arno Mayer in virulent terms. "A mockery of memory and history" "outrageous", "bizarre" and "perverse"? Stoning the messenger because they don't like the message, be he Jew or Gentile, is their age-old tactic. Again it was Jew versus Jew — dogma versus history.

=====

97. Guttenplan: Hilberg, Arendt, and Mayer are all not just Jews but refugees from the Nazis. There can be no doubting their obvious, sympathetic, personal identification with the victims of the Holocaust. "By 1942, in her eighties and blind," Raul Hilberg's grandmother "lay in bed most of the time," Hilberg writes in *The Politics of Memory* (1996). "Apparently that is where the German raiders found her and where they shot her on the spot." Hannah Arendt had been arrested for illegal Zionist activity, and interned by the Vichy French, before escaping to the United States. Arno Mayer's book opens with "A Personal Preface" telling of his own hair-raising escape from Luxembourg and occupied France, and of the fate of his grandfather, who refused to leave Luxembourg and died in Theresienstadt. Such personal bona fides didn't prevent the Anti-Defamation League from including Mayer in its 1993 report "Hitler's Apologists: The Anti-Semitic Propaganda of Holocaust 'Revisionism,'" where his work is cited as an example of "legitimate historical scholarship which relativizes the genocide of the Jews"; his crime is to "have argued, with no apparent anti-Semitic motivation" — note how the absence of evidence itself becomes incriminating — "that though millions of Jews were killed during WWII, there was actually no premeditated policy for this destruction."

ANSWER TO 97. One again, we see that Hannah Ahrendt was not arrested because she was a Jew but because "she engaged in illegal Zionist activity." Israel has been arresting Palestinians for 50 years for illegal PLO or other activities, making a thousand excuses and justifications for their arrests,

detentions and torture of Palestinians. Always the Jewish double standard!

Poor Arno Mayer, the Jewish refugee from the dreaded Nazis, gracing the same ADL smear book as the Ernst Zündels, Faurissons and Irvings of the world — because he dared to question their new cult of the Holocaust!

=====

98. Guttenplan: Defending Raul Hilberg or Arno Mayer from the charge of anti-Semitism (or, as it is more frequently put, "self-hatred") is tedious and pointless. So why bother? Because such attacks on honorable scholarship demonstrate that the Holocaust has from the very beginning been contested ground even — perhaps especially — among Jews themselves. And because it isn't only Holocaust deniers who twist facts, obscure the truth, and, in Deborah Lipstadt's phrase, create "immoral equivalencies."

ANSWER TO 98. Guttenplan better be careful! If he keeps up this line of reasoning, he will go "beyond the pale", as the Jewish Thought Police and Holocaust Orthodoxy Enforcers call free inquiry by Jews into their own history. "...it isn't only Holocaust deniers who twist facts, obscure the truth" and, to quote the self-appointed High Priestess of the Holocaust Dogma, none other than Deborah Lipstadt, who weighs in with the mighty phrase "...create immoral equivalencies." It's amazing what a good education in Israel can produce!

=====

99. Guttenplan: **The Lever of Guilt**

In Israel, as you might expect in a country where in the 1940s the slang for "Holocaust survivor" translated as "soap," the battle over how to represent the Nazi genocide has always been bare-knuckled and out in the open. The arguments go back to the Second World War itself, when supporters of mainstream Zionism sought to discredit the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe — the group agitating most noisily for rescue — as a vehicle of the right-wing Zionist terrorist group Irgun. As indeed it was. David Ben-Gurion and other Zionist leaders were not thoughtlessly "writing off" European Jewry, Peter Novick says. They were just making a "chilling ... appraisal of what was and was not possible."

ANSWER TO 99. The best source on this dark chapter of Jewish-Zionist history is Tom Segev's book, *The Seventh Million* and Edwin Black's book, "The Transfer Agreement." They are revealing treatises.

=====

100. Guttenplan: Still, when the dimensions of the Jewish catastrophe became clear, Ben-Gurion moved quickly to turn guilt into political capital. What is

notable about this effort is that it failed. With the possible exception of Britain, where fear of being compared to the Nazis may have prevented a more forceful response by London to the Zionists' unilateral declaration of independence, countries responded to the birth of Israel on the basis of their own national interest, as Novick points out. The Soviet Union, which was eager to undercut British influence in the Middle East, supported it. Countries with ties to the Arabs — Britain among them — did not. President Harry Truman, who recognized Israel over State Department opposition, may have been motivated by domestic political considerations — or by a sincere concern for Jewish refugees. But there is no evidence that guilt played any part in his decision. Indeed, as we have seen, the initial responses to the Eichmann trial revealed a mistrust of Israel's motives that was perhaps understandable, coming only a few years after President Dwight Eisenhower had condemned Israel's actions in the Suez crisis. Novick barely mentions Suez, which is a shame, because it gives strong support to his view that at least in the 1950s the Holocaust provided Israel with no useful "moral capital."

ANSWER TO 100. Interesting, the phrase "...in the 1950s, the Holocaust provided Israel with no useful moral capital." Is that callous, or what?

Support to Zionism was given for many reasons. The British gave them the Balfour Declaration because they were on the verge of losing the war in France against the Germans in 1916-17. Hitler cooperated with them because he wanted the Jews out of Europe. The Zionists were eager to get skilled German Jews for building their new state. Truman, according to Gore Vidal, the American Jewish playwright, got a \$2 million Jewish bribe in the form of an election contribution, when his campaign was virtually broke. (See Israel Shahak's book, "Jewish History, Jewish Religion")

101. Guttenplan: Novick also appears not to notice that just as the Cold War shaped American responses to the Holocaust, it also shaped responses to Israel — because until June of 1967 it was far from clear that Israel was on "our" side. After all, Ben-Gurion and his associates were socialists. In their war for independence the Israelis were armed with Czech machine guns; from 1956 to 1967 Israel bought the bulk of its weaponry from France, a country whose discontent with American power actually led it to withdraw from NATO's military command. And it was not until after the Six-Day War that Norman Podhoretz declared that Israel was the religion of the American Jews. What support there was tended to come from the left, from places like The Nation and the newspaper PM, whose columnist I. F. Stone was an early and vocal advocate for the new state.

=====

ANSWER TO 101. "Israel was the religion of the American Jews"? Something to think about for the American and Canadian Intelligence community in light of the Rosenberg, Lonsdale, and Pollard Spy Affair.

=====

102. Guttenplan: All that changed after 1967. Novick doesn't draw an explicit connection between Israel's debut as America's strategic asset in the Middle East and the explosion of Holocaust discourse in the United States, but what he does say is suggestive. For one thing, the image of Jews as military heroes effaced "the stereotype of weak and passive victims, which [had] inhibited Jewish discussion of the Holocaust." More important, in Cold War terms Israel was now unambiguously on America's team. And if circumstances made it easier for American Jews to talk about the Holocaust, to draw on the "moral capital" that Israel had miraculously accumulated, that was just as well. For in its determination to hold on to the territories gained in battle, Israel began to forfeit whatever sympathy it had attracted as an underdog.

ANSWER TO 102. No human rights story here — just cold-eyed, geopolitical military power considerations! Alleged cowards who walked by the millions like lambs to the slaughter transform miraculously into fierce warriors because of the use of the Holocaust as an instrument of policy. Amazing!

=====

103. Guttenplan: The crucial point, surely, is that it was only after Israel and the United States were bound together strategically that the Holocaust and support for Israel became, in Novick's phrase, "the twin pillars of American Jewish 'civil religion.'" Similarly, it was only in post-1967 America that certain aspects of the Holocaust and its aftermath — from questions of resistance and collaboration to arguments over the propriety of accepting reparation payments — became not just controversial but unmentionable. An exaggeration? In 1953 Lucy Dawidowicz, at the time the American Jewish Committee's resident expert on communism, could both criticize Israel for taking German money and invidiously contrast that willingness with Israel's refusal to take responsibility for displaced Palestinians. Thirty-five years later, when Arno Mayer merely disagreed with Dawidowicz's interpretation of Hitler's intentions, he was practically excommunicated.

ANSWER TO 103. The Holocaust — "the twin pillars of American Jewish 'civil religion.'" Peter Novick and Guttenplan are beginning to lay bare something most Goyim have been too shallow and stupid to see, much less comprehend in its importance. Arno Mayer was practically excommunicated. Is that proof of a cult-like religious mindset or what?

=====

104. Guttenplan: Though it is considered impolite to mention them in public, there are still a number of “live questions” about the Holocaust. The dispute between intentionalists like Dawidowicz, who say that genocide was part of Hitler’s plan from the beginning, and functionalists like Mayer, who argue that the Final Solution evolved in response to changing conditions and the fortunes of war, is far from settled. David Irving may seize on the arguments of the functionalists as part of his campaign to exculpate Hitler from responsibility for the Holocaust, but that hardly makes them his allies.

ANSWER TO 104. In other words, it’s okay for some intra-Jewish quibbling about the so-called Holocaust details, as long as no fundamental questions are asked about it — like “where is the Führer Order?” or “Where is the scientific proof for homicidal gas chambers?” etc. The Jewish factions want to continue to control and contain the Holocaust debate. They don’t want to lose control to some loose cannon Goy like David Irving, who might say anything, quicksilver as he is in his arguments.

=====

105. Guttenplan: Another open — though stifled — question regards the number of survivors. Irving’s claim that Jews inflated the number of Holocaust victims in order to extort money from Germany merely demonstrates his imperviousness to fact. The payments to Israel were for absorbing and resettling refugees, and it would thus have been in Israel’s interest to exaggerate the number of survivors, not the number of victims. But that doesn’t mean there weren’t individual beneficiaries who, in order to qualify for payment, claimed to have spent the war hiding in Poland when they had in fact been living, in relative safety if not in comfort, deep inside the Soviet Union.

ANSWER TO 105. One more time Guttenplan hijacks Revisionist scholarship, which unearthed many of these facts, like in Dr. Butz’s books, “Hoax of the 20th Century”, but even more so, in Sanning’s book *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*. Numbers do matter. Numbers are their Achilles Heel.

=====

106. Guttenplan: More delicate still is the question of survivor testimony. According to Elie Wiesel, “Any survivor has more to say than all the historians combined about what happened.” Would Wiesel censure Deborah Lipstadt for saying “Lots of survivors who arrived at Auschwitz will tell you they were examined by [Dr. Josef] Mengele. Then you ask them the date of their arrival, and you say, ‘Well, Mengele wasn’t in Auschwitz yet at that point.’ There were lots of doctors ... [somehow] they all become Mengele”? Would he censure her — or any other historian — for daring to ask for evidence, documents,

corroborating testimony? That, after all, is what historians do.

ANSWER TO 106. Survivor testimony: Here is what Samuel Gringauz had to say in the January, 1950 issue of the Jewish magazine, *Social Studies*.

“This hyperhistorical complex may be described as judeocentric, lococentric and egocentric. It concentrates historical relevance on Jewish problems of local events under the aspects of personal experience. This is the reason why most of the memoirs and reports are full of preposterous verbosity, graphomantic exaggeration, dramatic effects, overestimated self-inflation, dilettante philosophizing, would-be lyricism, unchecked rumors, bias, partisan attacks and apologies.”

Professor Michael de Bouard: “The record is rotten to the core.”

Professor Krystztof Dunin-Wasowicz: “...too many myths, legends, and fictional transformations...considerable tendency to give free reign to fantasy...”

And Shmul Krakowski of the Yad Vashem: Over half of testimonies “unreliable...inaccurate.”

Asking for evidence, documents, corroborating testimony of Holocaust survivors and their fanciful claims — Lipstadt, Wiesel and the ADL would call that “anti-Semitism”. Guttenplan realizes they have a problem and face a dilemma of major proportions, now that they have painted themselves into a corner with all their false claims and outright lies. How to escape the day of public exposure and historic reckoning? D-Day — “Decision Day — is here, even for Jewish historians, academics and writers like Guttenplan. Continue to lie — or come clean? What a dilemma!

=====

107. Guttenplan: And when they are prevented from doing it, either by Jewish groups who feel that the Holocaust belongs to them alone or by Zionists seeking to preserve Israel’s “moral capital,” the result is a blurring of distinctions between memory and propaganda that serves only the interests of the Nazi perpetrators and their political legatees.

ANSWER TO 107. No, Mr. Guttenplan! Exposing the Jewish-Israeli Holocaust misuse and abuse will serve the world. Decent Jews and decent Gentiles the world over are waiting for this liberation from this “Hoax of the 20th Century”, as Professor Butz of Northwestern University called it. The Holocaust has spiritually sickened the globe!

=====

108. Guttenplan: Yet time and again those who insist on the truth in all its "complex, unsentimental," paradoxical, and ambiguous detail are shouted down. Norman Finkelstein and Ruth Birn, whose book *A Nation on Trial* (1998) pointed out the many scholarly defects of Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, were subjected to a sustained campaign of personal abuse. Finkelstein and Birn were no more extreme in their condemnation than Raul Hilberg, whose essay deploring "The Goldhagen Phenomenon," in *Les Temps Modernes*, described the Harvard professor's work as "lacking in factual content and logical rigor" and casting a "cloud ... over the academic landscape." That didn't keep Abraham Foxman, the head of the Anti-Defamation League, from trying to discourage the publication of *A Nation on Trial*.

It isn't only anti-Semites who, in T. S. Eliot's infamous phrase, find a "large number of free-thinking Jews undesirable."

ANSWER TO 108. It amazes me that Guttenplan cannot take that one more step needed to appreciate that it is more often than not Gentile Revisionists such as Dr. Robert Faurisson, Dr. Arthur Butz, Mark Weber, Udo Walendy and David Irving as well as the Ernst Zündels of the world who are being shouted down, bombed, beaten, jailed, fined and burned out by arsonists - not Jews like Arno Mayer or even Norman Finkelstein.

It is largely Gentile Revisionists who for 50 years have insisted on the truth in all its complex, unsentimental, paradoxical and ambiguous detail, like Leuchter chiseling away samples of rocks and bricks in Auschwitz - the 'holiest of holies', according to that hypocrite van Pelt! - and Irving talking about "45,000 tonnes of dead meat" or Zündel lawyer, Doug Christie, fearlessly cross-examining self-proclaimed Holocaust survivors and eye-witnesses. It also includes people like me, the son of Germany, who dared ask the unambiguous question: "Did Six Million Really Die?" Was I merely shouted down? I was mercilessly harassed by a never-ending campaign of terror, vilification, law suits, beatings, bombings, arsons, jailings, crippling fines and horrendous legal fees. Did Arno Mayer, Finkelstein, Hilberg et al have to endure this? Of course not. They were Jews.

=====

109. Guttenplan: **Diana's Lawyer**

Though the desk in Anthony Julius's Bloomsbury office is a lawyerly clutter of files and documents, some of them belonging to his client Deborah Lipstadt, every other surface is piled high with mounds of art books that tumble from tables and chairs onto the carpet, forming drifts around our feet. Julius is writing

a book on modern art.

The oldest of four sons, Julius eventually graduated from Cambridge with first-class honors and could easily have taken a Ph.D. Then his father, a men's-wear retailer, suddenly died of a brain tumor, so, Julius says, "I stuck with law."

When Diana, Princess of Wales, decided she'd had enough of Prince Charles, she needed an outsider, someone whom the British establishment would regard as "unclubbable," someone who couldn't be "gotten to." A Jewish partner in a prominent London firm, Anthony Julius, got Diana a settlement worth roughly \$25 million. By way of a thank you, Diana sent him a silver blotter from Asprey's. Her patronage made him the most famous lawyer in Britain. She also made him an executor of her will.

ANSWER TO 109. Interesting! Very interesting! So Anthony Julius is an "unclubbable" lawyer, somebody who couldn't be "gotten to"? These are Guttenplans own words. It's logical to infer that he at least knows of cases where lawyers could be "clubbed" and "gotten to"! Does it seem far-fetched to assume that prosecutors and even judges who try Holocaust Revisionists can be "gotten to..." and "clubbed"? I think to believe otherwise would be a trifle naive.

=====

110. Guttenplan: Anthony Julius eventually got his Ph.D. His thesis, on T. S. Eliot, anti-Semitism, and literary form, begins,

Anti-Semites are not all the same. Some break Jewish bones, others wound Jewish sensibilities. Eliot falls into the second category. He was civil to Jews he knew, offensive to those who merely knew him through his work. He wounded his Jewish readers, if not the Jews of his acquaintance, to whom, apparently, he was 'not disagreeable.' Though worth noting, this is not a distinction that yields a defence to the charge of anti-Semitism. If the work, or some notable part of it, is anti-Semitic, it is the work of an anti-Semite. With his large, close-cropped head, ambling gait, and slightly stooped posture, Julius looks a bit like a bear in a pinstripe suit — that is, if you can imagine a bear who, though capable of tearing you apart, would much rather simply persuade you of the error of your views. When I ask him, with my tape recorder running, why this case matters, his response is guarded, almost offhand: "Does this case matter? To whom? It matters to Deborah Lipstadt because she's being sued." When I turn the tape recorder off, his words are equally careful, but there is a flash of anger in his manner that is actually frightening in a man otherwise so perfectly contained. Julius has tangled with Irving before. In 1992 Irving was expelled from Canada, and one of the documents he later obtained under Canada's Access to Information

Law was a dossier compiled, he says, by the Board of Deputies of British Jews which had been sent to the Canadian authorities. Irving wanted to sue for libel, but Julius, who acted for the board at the time, said that Irving was "sadly too late" in filing the proper papers.

ANSWER TO 110. Substitute the word "anti-Gentile" instead of "anti-Semite". In the case of the Germans, substitute "... anti-Germans are not all the same" or "anti-Nazis are not all the same..." and you will get a feel for what is going down here. Somebody is once again parading his mindset around for all the world to see.

Compiling dossiers on historians, and secretly transmitting them to governments of countries 5000 miles away does not disturb Guttenplan at all. Not a word of admonition. No outrage. Just smug satisfaction that a shyster was able to finagle a way for his Jewish client to get away with what was most likely a crime in England.

=====

111. Guttenplan: Julius knows that this time there will be no such reprieve. He won't discuss the trial in any detail even off the record. But the English rules of procedure allow for very few surprises. Both sides have had to reveal in advance not only what documents they want to cite and what witnesses and experts (scholars or other specialists) they are going to call but also what those witnesses and experts are likely to say.

ANSWER TO 111. So what is all this moaning by Lipstadt about? Does she know she libeled Irving, and is about to face the music?

=====

112. Guttenplan: Irving's few witnesses relate to the question of how he obtained the Goebbels diaries that formed the basis for his biography. Although a side issue for Lipstadt, this dispute is at the center of Irving's suit against Gitta Sereny. Irving's experts — a separate category — address two areas. Like Julius, Kevin MacDonald, a professor of psychology at California State University at Long Beach, believes that not all anti-Semites are the same. In his view, though, the distinction is between simple prejudice and the hatred that he feels is to be expected given certain aspects of what he regards as typically Jewish behavior.

ANSWER TO 112. Irving's strategy in this trial, if he has one, is not easily discernible — for friend or foe!

=====

113. Guttenplan: Irving's second expert, John Fox, formerly the editor of The British Journal of Holocaust Education, will testify about an attempt by a group

of British Jews to get him to discourage publication of Irving's Goebbels biography in Great Britain, and will give his own assessment of what he sees as Lipstadt's role in enforcing a kind of orthodoxy in discussions of the Holocaust. Fox's battles with British Jewry, although perhaps relevant in his mind, have little bearing on Lipstadt's case. But his claim that attempts to discredit David Irving do not spring from communal self-defense or a concern for the truth but are, rather, part of a broader campaign to proscribe discussion of the Holocaust will need to be met head on.

ANSWER TO 113. That ought to be an interesting encounter!

=====

114. Guttenplan: Of course, if Julius can prove that every word Lipstadt wrote about Irving is true, the question of her motives may not matter. Lipstadt's witness statements cover everything from extremism in the Pacific Northwest to Irving's dealings with the Russian archivists who control access to the Goebbels material. But it is her experts and their testimony that will make up the heart of this case. Judging by the experts he has assembled, it is obvious that Anthony Julius is perfectly aware this is no simple case of libel. From Christopher Browning, the author of Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland (1992), to Robert John Van Pelt, a co-author of Auschwitz: 1270 to the Present (1996), Lipstadt's experts are for the most part the standard authorities in their field. Yet several of them have submitted expert reports that are the equivalent, in both scope and scholarly apparatus, of full-scale books, but with a single subject: David Irving.

ANSWER TO 114. Aha! Julius is perfectly aware this is no simple case of libel!? At least that is now out in the open!

Admissions that the Lipstadt experts submitted book-length studies as witness statements, all with a single subject, namely David Irving, is also revealing. The bearer of bad tidings is to be stoned, publicly crucified - to save their agenda, their Holocaust, to keep the gravy train rolling! They do not want to be deprived of the shield behind which they hide, much less the Auschwitz club they swing so recklessly to subdue their enemies.

=====

115. Guttenplan: The shortest of Lipstadt's expert reports is Browning's "Evidence for the Implementation of the Final Solution" — a sixty-three-page summary of the documentation that Lipstadt's lawyers will argue Irving has had to either ignore or distort to maintain his views on the gas chambers. Next in length comes the ninety-page treatise "David Irving and Right-Wing Extremism," by Roger Eatwell, a professor of politics at the University of Bath. Hajo Funke, a professor of political science at the Free University of Berlin,

spends 157 pages detailing Irving's connections with German neo-Nazis and Holocaust deniers. A seventeen-year chronology of Irving's dealings with North American "hate groups," prepared by Brian Levin, then at Stockton College, is similarly extensive, and contains, among other details, an account of Irving's long acquaintance with David Duke. According to Levin, the ex-Klansman's musings on the Holocaust and other topics in his book *My Awakening* (1998) were shaped by Irving's editorial advice. Peter Longerich, the author of *Policy of Annihilation* (1998) and a history of Nazi storm troopers (both in German), and a co-editor of the German edition of the *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, has contributed a seventy-seven-page summary of the evidence for Hitler's responsibility and a ninety-three-page exposition of the planned, systematic nature of the Nazi genocide.

ANSWER TO 115. Poor Judge Gray! They obviously hope that pages and pages of verbal diarrhea, camouflaged as "Holocaust scholarship" will baffle brains!

=====

116. Guttenplan: These reports, all of which were at one point posted on Irving's Web site, rebut, with varying degrees of pedantry but with uniform attention to detail, different aspects of either Irving's claim against Lipstadt or what might be called Irving's "case" against the Holocaust. But the centerpiece of Lipstadt's defense will undoubtedly be the 726-page examination of Irving's entire oeuvre by Richard Evans, a professor of modern history at Cambridge and a Fellow of the British Academy. Among his twenty books are *Rereading German History: From Unification to Reunification, 1800-1996* (1997) and *In Hitler's Shadow: West German Historians and the Attempt to Escape From the Nazi Past* (1989). Evans is, as they say, familiar with the literature — hardly surprising, considering that he wrote much of it, including standard works on German feminism, the German underworld, and the history of capital punishment in Germany.

ANSWER TO 116. It will be interesting to see what this "clash of the titans" will produce. Those court transcripts will be worth their weight in gold for researchers for years to come.

=====

117. Guttenplan: Aside from reading Irving's books (both the English and the German editions), Evans, thanks to the pretrial "discovery" process that is routine in such cases, had access to videotapes and audiocassettes of Irving's speeches, tens of thousands of pages of documents, Irving's complete private diaries, thousands of letters, and a great deal of other material. Evans looked at the totality of Irving's career, from the Dresden book to the Goebbels biography. What he found shocked him deeply.

ANSWER TO 117. I would not be surprised that what the world will find out about Richard Evans and the other "Holocaust scholars" with the help of this trial might be shocking as well, if Irving can survive the strain and pressure.

=====

118. Guttenplan: (Evans speaking): Penetrating beneath the confident surface of his prose quickly revealed a mass of distortion and manipulation ... so tangled that detailing it sometimes took up many more words than ... Irving's original account. Unpicking the eleven-page narrative of the anti-Jewish pogrom of the so-called Reichskristallnacht in Irving's book *Goebbels: Mastermind of the 'Third Reich'* and tracing back every part of it to the documentation on which it purports to rest takes up over seventy pages of the present Report. A similar knotted web of distortions, suppressions and manipulations became evident in every single instance which we examined. I was not prepared for the sheer depths of duplicity which I encountered in Irving's treatment of the historical sources, nor for the way in which this dishonesty permeated his entire written and spoken output. It is as all-pervasive in his early work as it is in his later publications It is clear ... that Irving's claim to have a very good and thorough knowledge of the evidence on the basis of which the history of Nazi Germany has to be written is completely justified. His numerous mistakes and egregious errors are not, therefore, due to mere ignorance or sloppiness; on the contrary, it is obvious that they are calculated and deliberate. That is precisely why they are so shocking.

118. Having gone through years of litigation, and having helped prepare for the cross-examination of Raul Hilberg, Christopher Browning, and many "survivors" certainly revealed "a similar knotted web of distortions, suppressions and manipulations." In plain English, never have so many lied so brazenly for so long about so little - as these people did about the so-called "Holocaust" in their writings and testimony. I remember how Christie heroically decimated people like Vrba, Friedman, Urstein, Hilberg, Browning and others. Unfortunately Irving, although brilliant, is no law-school-trained, experienced cross-examiner like Doug Christie.

=====

119. Guttenplan: Evans's findings, though doubtless unwelcome to Irving, ought also to cause a certain amount of discomfort among Irving's defenders in journalism and the academy. Irving has relied in the past, and continues to rely in the present, on the fact that his readers and listeners, reviewers and interviewers lack either the time, or the expertise, to probe deeply enough into the sources he uses for his work to uncover the distortions, suppressions and manipulations to which he has subjected them. How Do We Know?

ANSWER TO 119. The same can be said for Guttenplan and, certainly, for Deborah Lipstadt, Christopher Browning and most likely the other witnesses as well. Otherwise, Wilkimorski could not have conned the literary world, and the so-called "Hitler Diaries" would have been recognized as a forgery early on.

=====

120. Guttenplan: Here is some risk," Judge Charles Gray told me in his chambers on the day before his first hearing on the case, "of one's being asked to become a historian. Judges aren't historians."

ANSWER TO 120. Judges aren't historians! Keep that always in mind. The most important thing to recognize is that courtrooms are contemporary ideological battle fields, and as such, crucially important for the precedents they carve. Even so, they are poor places to discuss and debate controversial issues of history, because defendants and prosecutors frequently chafe under, and are hampered by, rules and requirements imposed by legal procedures. One should think of political trials as very restricted, stilted debates, supervised by a moderator who has absolute power to dismiss virtually any argument or document — a man called a judge.

It must be understood that the judges in Revisionist trials are human beings — men and women who have usually grown up in the same nations and pretty well in the same environment as the accusers or the prosecutors. Judges went to the same schools and had the same doctored, slanted text books and history courses. They earned their grades and diplomas and degrees by largely agreeing with what the instructing professors had taught them and by regurgitating ideologically approved opinions and texts from their recommended reading lists.

This means that judges, prosecutors and jurors are a reflection of the prevailing theory of history — the culture myths of the day. In Nazi Germany it would have been that the Jews were a huge problem for the well-being of the nation. In Stalin's Russia it would have been that capitalists were evil and the proletarian masses were good. In Canada, Germany, the USA, France and England it is the same — there is uncritical acceptance that Hitler was a monster, and World War II was fought by the Allies for a supremely righteous cause - increasingly, as is falsely claimed, to "... save the Jews from genocide".

This post-war view of history, laced with Allied propaganda claims of World War II and buttressed by the grotesque Nuremberg trial proceedings and

verdicts and the media's incessant, repetitious brainwashing campaign, are what judges and jurors have been exposed to since they were born — in school, in universities and in their daily lives. Every time they turned on the radio, the TV, or picked up a newspaper, every time they went to a library or a bookstore, they were confronted with the same one-sided point of view. There simply was no balance in the information available.

An accused Holocaust Revisionist, or even a World War II Revisionist is never ever judged by an impartial judge or a "jury of his peers". He is always, without exception, judged by a judge or jury of his enemies — at least by the judge's or jury's mindset formed by his enemies.

=====

121. Guttenplan: Gray's disclaimer is slightly misleading. Appointed to the bench only eighteen months ago, Gray spent ten years as a Queen's counsel, or QC — the elite among trial lawyers. He represented the Tory Cabinet Minister Jonathan Aitken in his suit against The Guardian and defended the Daily Mirror journalist Alistair Campbell — now Prime Minister Tony Blair's spokesman — when he was sued by a Tory member of Parliament. His most famous case, however, came when Lord Aldington sued the writer Nikolai Tolstoy over charges that at the end of the Second World War, Aldington had been responsible for handing over to the Soviets — and certain death — Cossacks who'd fought in the German army and been taken prisoner by the British. Gray's pleadings, which, as he told me, "did involve history," resulted in an award to his client of a record £1.5 million (\$2.4 million) in damages.

ANSWER TO 121. Judge Gray is strictly a member of the establishment, having attended all the right schools, and no doubt belonging to the right social clubs or lodges. He is not immune from the public pressure, the odium which would attach itself to him and his career if he found for the embattled Irving. It would take an almost Solomon-like individual to please everyone in this case.

=====

122. Guttenplan: If Gray seems unduly modest about his command of history, his concern to ensure not just the reality but also the appearance of a fair trial makes more sense. Anthony Julius will be joined at the defense table by Richard Rampton QC, the lawyer representing Penguin Books. David Irving will represent himself. Libel cases cost thousands of dollars a day, and under British law any attorney who took on Irving's case might be liable for the other side's costs if he lost. As a "litigant in person," when David Irving appears in court, he will be on his own.

ANSWER TO 122. It is said that "he who defends himself in court has a

fool for a client.” I don’t know if this is a slogan invented by an advertising agency for lawyers? David Irving is sharp. Contrary to what Richard Evans says in his smear job on Irving, David Irving is no slouch and no pushover. He has a grasp of history, near photographic recall of facts, figures, names, documents. I would not count that man out if his physical and emotional health remains stable. He says he could not afford a lawyer. If that is true, it is infinitely sad. He faces a legal team of 20 people, according to early press reports and observers. If he loses, it might only mean that he was deficient in the legal department, not deficient in his grasp of history.

=====

123. Guttenplan: “It makes the judge’s task more difficult,” Gray says. “One has to ensure that he’s not disadvantaged by not having the legal expertise available to the other side.” This disparity in means may be good news for Deborah Lipstadt and her supporters, though Richard Rampton, who acted for McDonald’s in its recent Pyrrhic victory over a pair of penniless vegetarian anarchists, also litigants in person, which cost the corporation \$15 million and gained nothing but bad publicity, is well aware of the perils of overkill.

ANSWER TO 123. Nothing but bad publicity? Irving had to get used to that for the last 10 years since testifying in Toronto in the Zündel Trial where he endorsed Leuchter’s findings. Deborah Lipstadt and Penguin Books have generated more soul-searching in somewhat tendentious articles about the misuse of the Holocaust — its “instrumentalism for the Jewish agenda” — than all the Revisionist pamphleteers the world over could produce in years of toil. If Irving loses, he will simply declare bankruptcy — and continue writing! Pyrrhic victory indeed!

=====

124. Guttenplan: David Irving has had decades of practice at playing the lone iconoclast whose devotion to truth puts establishment noses out of joint. This pose is, I suspect, what accounts for his unlikelier supporters. Certainly it was one he adopted with relish during our interview, whether by inviting me to share his belief that “the Conservative Party is largely financed by the CIA” or by jauntily acknowledging a desire “to see egg on faces.”

ANSWER TO 124. Yes — egg on their faces! Pranks! Irving delights in that, like the schoolboy he still is, hoisting the hammer and sickle flag.

=====

125. Guttenplan: A desire we all share. At times the contrarian impulse is almost enough to make us forget that Irving brought this on himself. He is the plaintiff, Lipstadt the defendant.

Irving’s odd fascination, though, has little to do with the urge to see authority get its comeuppance — and even less with some hidden vein of nostalgia for the Third Reich. It is rooted instead in something far more basic, something that mere facts can never completely banish: doubt. How do we know that there really were gas chambers at Auschwitz? Or that millions of Jews were killed? What if, as Irving says, we are off by an order of magnitude? Even if the Nazis killed only hundreds of thousand of Jews, isn’t that bad enough? Do the numbers really matter?

ANSWER TO 125. Doubt — sowing doubt about the Holocaust — erodes faith in the Dogma of the Day! That’s why there were laws in every country in every war to punish rumor mongers who were sowing doubt in final victory. In German it’s called “Wehrzersetzung” — weakening the will to fight — and a goodly number of concentration camp inmates were in the hole for that crime! But what is Guttenplan really saying in the paragraph above? That doubt has crept even into his Jewish brain?

=====

126. Guttenplan: Last May, just as I started reading about this trial, the London Review of Books ran an account by a reporter for The Guardian of her attempts to corroborate accounts of atrocities in Kosovo. Her tale was inconclusive, honorably so. But her final words made me deeply angry.

Maybe the truth here is not one thing: but I don’t want to be an accomplice to a lie Nobody much wants to return to Jean Cocteau, but there was something soothing in the words my friend quoted. ‘History is a combination of reality and lies,’ he said. ‘The reality of history becomes a lie. The reality of the fable becomes the truth.’ That seemed to me a fancy argument for letting herself off the hook. Maybe she couldn’t find out what happened. Maybe she should have tried harder. And if she believes that reporting the facts makes no difference to whether the fable becomes the truth, and even finds the prospect “soothing,” then maybe she should find another line of work. All the same, I understood the temptation.

ANSWER TO 126. The “Holocaust” is a combination of reality and lies. It’s a classic. Guttenplan senses it. The reality of the Holocaust fable has become the truth for millions of hitherto uncritical readers. Irving with his brash one-liners is supplying jolt after jolt — in fact, a reality check to their thinking. It’s the nightmare of every Holocaust Promoter that the fable will be examined.

=====

127. Guttenplan: **The Atheist**

It wasn't that I thought Irving might be right — more that I allowed myself to wonder, with a little shudder, "But does it matter?" It wasn't, in other words, exactly that I doubted the facts; rather, I was curious about what would happen if the facts somehow made no difference.

What pulled me back was a memory: I am six years old, and my father has brought his best friend home for dinner. After we eat, the friend takes the back off our television and shows me the tubes lighting up inside. One is burned out, and as he replaces it, I notice a line of numbers on his arm, just below the wrist. "What are those, Uncle Mike?" He tells me that the Germans put them there when he was a little boy, "so I wouldn't get lost."

My Uncle Mike was never a little boy. When he was twelve or thirteen, the Germans occupied Hungary, and his entire family was put on a train to Auschwitz. Big for his age, and claiming to be older, he was sent to work in the mines. This was 1944, and Auschwitz was liberated by the Red Army in January of 1945. By then the rest of his family had been gassed.

ANSWER TO 127. "By then the rest of his family had been gassed..." Says who? Proven by what? What if Irving is right? How will Guttenplan explain his unexamined childhood — or should one say, childish belief in the Gas Chamber Myth?

=====

128. Guttenplan: The truth is, I can't be certain of all these details, and my Uncle Mike has been dead for some time. I was reminded of him while reading Irving's response to the obvious questions: What happened to the missing Jews? If they didn't die in the camps, where were they? Irving talks about "the large number that turned up in the state of Palestine, what's now the state of Israel," and sometimes, as if acknowledging that this number isn't nearly large enough, claims that others might have been killed in Dresden. The rest, he suggests, fled to the USSR or the United States. As a simple matter of accounting, this is preposterous. As an explanation, it is also monstrous — because the assumption behind it is that, lured by the good life to the United States, or chasing the workers' paradise in Russia, or seeking the Zionist dream in Israel, people like my Uncle Mike would simply forget that they had mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, grandparents, children, and wouldn't bother to look for them, which is why so many Jews are still unaccounted for. In other words, it presumes that Jews are not human beings.

ANSWER TO 128. Irving, the non-Holocaust expert, the non-Revisionist historian, gives a less-than-in-depth response. Dr. Faurisson, Dr. Butz, even the overly polite Mark Weber would have given Guttenplan little

space to exercise his wild fantasies. Some of the witnesses in the Zündel Trial, bemoaning the alleged loss of dozens of cousins, nieces, aunts, uncles, even brothers or sisters — when asked point blank in court by Christie whether they had ever contacted the International Tracing Service of the Red Cross in Arolsen to find their relatives - had to admit they did not. Why not? Did they know their relatives were alive under different names in faraway places, collecting pensions and restitution? What is one to think?

=====

129. Guttenplan: No one knows this better than Raul Hilberg. The Politics of Memory tells the story of Hilberg's uncle Josef, interned by the Vichy French in 1940.

My father, by then in New York, received Josef's frantic appeals for help, but there was no money for tickets which might have enabled Josef to escape to America. When the deportations from the Vichy-French zone began in 1942, Josef disappeared. "The blood of my brother is upon me," my father would say Hilberg, who spent years of his life in archives, never forgot about his uncle Josef. In 1978 he found him, on a list of deportees from France: Joseph Gaber. "He was deported on August 19, 1942, and arrived in Auschwitz two days later," Hilberg writes. "Since he was already forty-eight years old, he must have been gassed immediately."

ANSWER TO 129. Josef Gaber, brother of Raul Hilberg's father! Strange — two brothers having different last names. Something to be looked into in the Death Registry books. We must check for "Gaber," not "Hilberg," obviously. One more puzzle to solve — Revisionists to the front!

=====

130. Guttenplan: Yet when St. Martin's canceled Irving's Goebbels biography, Raul Hilberg stood up for David Irving. "If these people want to speak," he told Hitchens, "let them I am not for taboos and I am not for repression." Hilberg reaffirmed these views to me over the telephone last summer, with two minor modifications: "Denial hurts people. There are survivors. That should not be forgotten." And "I believe in the freedom not to be responsible. But that doesn't mean I endorse it."

ANSWER TO 130. That hypocrite Hilberg! "I am not for repression"! He had no qualms or ethical concerns leaving the United States with its First Amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing Freedom of Expression to come to Canada for over a week — for pay in the neighborhood of US\$20,000! - to help convict me, to have me jailed, silenced and deported to Germany to more jail time for not believing the chief lie of the Jewish agenda. Some mind on parade here!

=====

131. Guttenplan: What Hilberg does endorse is facts: numbers, names, places, dates. When I arrived at Hilberg's house in Vermont, at the beginning of September, we began by talking about numbers. In *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Hilberg says one million Jews were killed at Auschwitz. His total for the Holocaust, however, is 5.1 million, not six million, a conclusion that has caused him no end of trouble. Does it really matter? I asked.

ANSWER TO 131. Hilberg believes in his own set of numbers. One more time: The Polish authorities, and the Zionist propagandists used to claim 4 million victims for Auschwitz alone. Then, after the Zündel Trial, they first reduced the numbers to 1.1 million. Under Jewish protest, they raised it to 1.6 million. Most Jewish encyclopedias say 2.5 million. Hoess, the tortured one-time Commandant of Auschwitz "confessed" to a full million more than the Poles claim since 1993 - namely 2.6 million. For good measure, he even claimed "gassings" in a non-existent facility called "Wolzec":

We now know from the *Book Legions of Death* (Robert Butler, Hamlyn Paperbacks) that Hoess was beaten almost to death by Jewish members of the British Field Police upon capture, and badly mistreated thereafter. His wife and children were threatened with deportation to Siberia.

Here is how such confessions were obtained:

Clarke recalls vividly: "He was lying on top of a three-tier bunker wearing a new pair of silk pyjamas. We discovered later that he had lost the cyanide pill most of them carried. Not that he would have had much chance to use it because we had rammed a torch into his mouth."

Hoess screamed in terror at the mere sight of British uniforms.

Clarke yelled: "What is your name?"

With each answer of "Franz Lang", Clarke's hand crashed into the face of his prisoner. The fourth time that happened, Hoess broke and admitted who he was.

The admission suddenly unleashed the loathing of the Jewish sergeants in the arresting party whose parents had died in Auschwitz following the order signed by Hoess.

The prisoner was torn from the top bunk, the pyjamas ripped from his body. He was then dragged naked to one of the slaughter tables, where it seemed to Clarke the blows and screams were endless.

Eventually, the Medical Officer urged the Captain: "Call them off, unless you want to take back a corpse."

A blanket was thrown over Hoess, and he was dragged to Clarke's car, where the sergeant poured a substantial slug of whisky down his throat. Then Hoess tried to sleep.

Clarke thrust his service stick under the man's eyelids and ordered in German: "Keep your pig eyes open, you swine."

For the first time, Hoess trotted out his oft-repeated justification: "I took my orders from Himmler. I am a soldier in the same way as you are a soldier, and we had to obey orders."

The party arrived back at Heide around three in the morning. The snow was swirling still, but the blanket was torn from Hoess, and he was made to walk completely nude through the prison yard to his cell.

It took three days to get a coherent statement out of him. But once he started talking, there was no holding him."(Legions of Death, pp. 236-237)

Hoess gave his "testimony" and "affidavit" under oath in a language he did not speak or understand. Historians today are finally admitting that Hoess was a totally unreliable witness. Even Christopher Browning admitted that in a *Vanity Fair* article some years ago already. Yet the "Six Million" number simply refuses to die!

Note this for future reference, one more time: The Death Registries of Auschwitz detail 74,000, of which less than 30,000 have Jewish names. So believe what you want. Numbers are obviously just numbers to these people.

=====

132. Guttenplan: "Yes, it matters," Hilberg said. "It matters on a variety of counts. When you segment these losses by country, you find that the major difference between my count and those who say six million ... is the Soviet Union. Which means, if they didn't die, they're there That matters, because you are talking about a substantial part of Jewish history. And you're talking

about current Jewish history!"

ANSWER TO 132. Hilberg knows that they are there — for he has undoubtedly read the Revisionist studies by Sanning and others about the “Korherr Report.” Irving is right. Jewish victims number at most in the hundreds of thousands of all causes. Not millions! Regardless of what he might now say — possibly to curry favor with Judge Gray.

=====

133. Guttenplan: Hilberg launched into a learned and fascinating lecture on the vagaries of the Soviet census, the politics of census data, and the dangers of accepting unsourced estimates. “The German statisticians called it a house number,” he said, “whenever a number like that appears [that] you can’t prove.”

ANSWER TO 133. That’s the first thing Hilberg has said in years with which I could agree.

=====

134. Guttenplan: I asked about gas chambers. Irving has devoted so much energy to creating doubt about gas chambers. Why? “People are shot or hacked to death in other countries,” Hilberg said, “even after World War Two — Rwanda, for example. You built the gas chamber with a view to killing a mass of people. Once you have a gas chamber, you have a vision, and the vision is total annihilation. In a gas chamber you don’t see the victim. So the gas chamber in that sense is more dangerous, the gas chamber is more criminal. The gas chamber has wider implications. So when you deny the gas chamber, you deny not just a part of the event but one of the defining concepts. Auschwitz has become the synonym for the Holocaust. And of course you deny, apart from anything else, the death of several million people.”

ANSWER TO 134. Since the Germans did not build homicidal gas chambers — an entirely American concept for executing criminals, expensive and impractical as well as inefficient - Hilberg can philosophize all he wants. His Talmudic gyrations don’t amount to a row of beans!

The gas chambers are at the core of their lie! And how did it come about? Because Rudolf Hoess, Commandant of Auschwitz, supposedly “confessed.”

When this whole campaign of deception started, the victorious Allies and their Jewish puppet masters looked around, saw Germany in ruins, all their former enemies in their captivity and already half starved to death, or even beaten to death, many on trial in Nuremberg and hanged, and decided that this was the time to take “revenge”:

Julius Streicher, for instance, as reported in the London Times, April 27, 1946, was tortured, whipped, spat on, and forced to drink from a latrine. Streicher’s testimony was later stricken from the record of the trial. Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, referred to Nuremberg as a “high grade lynching party” and Judge Charles Wennerstrum, who presided over one of the Allied war crimes tribunals at Nuremberg, talked none-too-cryptically about the “recently naturalized aliens” — a euphemism of the time for the flood of Jewish emigrés who flooded into America, having very nicely survived World War II.

They not only thought they could get away with lying about what happened to them — hell, they were even getting away with torture and murder! Psychopaths that they are, they lived for the moment of bloodlust, thinking only of today, their moment of total victory over their hated Goy enemy. Little did they know there were already the Faurissons, Irvings, Butzes and Zundels climbing out of their diapers and play pens. Fred Leuchter and Germar Rudolf were not even born yet - and yet here they are, their scientific reports internationally acclaimed and feared.

=====

135. Guttenplan: Whatever we talked about — Goldhagen, Hitler’s guilt, the parallel lives of Soviet and American Jews — we seemed always to come back to numbers. “These numbers do matter,” Hilberg said. “They also matter for a very simple reason — call it religious, if you like.” At this point he saw my gaze shift from the Teletubbies magnets on his refrigerator to the menorah on top of his television set.

ANSWER TO 135. Hilberg the Atheist trots out religion for his beliefs. Religion is frequently the refuge for scoundrels.

=====

136. Guttenplan: “I’m an atheist,” he said. “All these things belong to my wife, not me. I am an atheist. But there is ultimately, if you don’t want to surrender to nihilism entirely, the matter of a record. Does the record matter? In my judgment it is not discussible. It is not arguable. It matters because it matters to me — it’s my life.”

ANSWER TO 136. The gall of these people! Only their figures, their records matter? The lie has become their whole life? How right he is! They are consumed by it, fearful their carefully spun net of deception will be slashed like a spider web by a stick.

=====

137. Guttenplan: The sanctity of facts. As I left Hilberg, I thought, It’s not much. After a lifetime of studying brutality, inhumanity, murder on an industrial

scale, after personal tragedy and professional conflict, this is what he has left to hold on to. The sanctity of facts. And yet Hilberg's passion for detail, his police-reporter's faith in getting it down right, stayed with me longer than any of the conflicting sympathies aroused by my inquiries. The sanctity of facts. It isn't much. It may not be enough. But it is all we have.

ANSWER TO 137. For Hilberg and Guttenplan to talk about them believing in the sanctity of facts is really *chutzpah*. They are simply two Jewish writers trying to delay the inevitable exposure of the Holocaust as the biggest "Hoax of the 20th century." Holocaust revisionists will have brought this about — not Hilberg or Guttenplan. This article — the longest ever in a mainstream press organ — needed to be commented on for truth and accuracy's sake.

— Ernst Zündel

The Eichmann Memoirs

In what is seen by some as a desperate move to shore up their disintegrating case, Lipstadt's defense team in David Irving's libel action, requested from Israel the release of 1300 pages of Eichmann's notes and private papers that he accumulated while being held in solitary confinement in Israel, after being kidnapped from Argentina by Mossad agents.

This was a sensational development, for Israel has sat on these documents for forty years — not releasing them for fear Holocaust revisionists would exploit their contents, contradictions etc. Leading Israelis have cautioned against their release, some saying that historically they were of little value.

Yehuda Bauer, head of the Yad Vashem Historical Institute, said that Eichmann changed his tune to win favor with his Israeli captors. (AP Feb. 29, 2000)

Ha'aretz (Feb. 29, 2000) called them "jailhouse memoirs." Amon Hausner, a lawyer and the son of Gideon Hausner, who prosecuted Eichmann, was against the release and questioned the wisdom of using them in court.

The *London Times* (March 1, 2000) reports that Eichmann does not once mention Zyklon 'B' — which was supposedly the killing compound. He claims that Höss, the Auschwitz commandant told him that carbon monoxide was used — that's something new!

Other press reports talk about cotton soaked in sulfuric acid having been used.

Amon Hausner said that enough holocaust survivors were still around who could testify to the gas chambers. Why use the writings of a Nazi war criminal?

David Irving reports heightened media interest. Even Israeli Television has interviewed him as has *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, ZDF and others.

The Eichmann Diary release was just the publicity shot in the arm the Irving-Lipstadt case needed. The press should now be locked in for the rest of the trial.

Why the Lipstadt legal team felt it necessary to enlist the help of the Israeli state is odd.

How can the self-serving, obviously coached, lurid horror tales, possibly win brownie points with a judge?

Truly, never have so many lied and cried for so long, about so little, for so much profit!